

new economic opportunity in over two-thirds of the Nation's counties.

The American people enjoy an abundance of top quality foods and spend only about 18.5 percent of their disposable income for it. Nowhere else in the world is food so plentiful and never has it been relatively so cheap. In addition, over 40 million Americans, many with low incomes, have a better diet due to expanded food distribution programs.

Agricultural exports in 1965 are estimated at \$6.2 billion—two-fifths more than in 1960. About one-fourth of our exports are food-for-peace shipments that meet food needs and foster economic development in friendly nations all around the world.

New programs have enabled us to nearly eliminate the astronomical grain surpluses of 1960 and 1961. And the Food and Agri-

culture Act of 1965 now gives us new long-term farm programs running through 1969.

On the basis of its present progress agriculture can look forward confidently to new horizons.

We expect another rise of perhaps a half billion dollars in farm income this year—with additional increases after that.

We expect accelerated progress in the creation of new jobs, new industries, new opportunities throughout rural America.

We expect further reductions in the real cost of food. By 1970 we will be spending only about 17 percent of our disposable income for food, and for a better diet too. As a result, a family of four will have \$160 more a year to spend on other things.

We expect grain surpluses to disappear before 1970 and we look for substantial reductions in the surpluses of cotton and tobacco.

We expect continued growth in farm exports, perhaps as much as 25 percent by 1970—pushing exports well beyond \$7 billion.

But, as President Johnson pointed out in signing the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, new ways must constantly be explored "to keep agriculture and agricultural policy up to date, to get the full benefit of new findings and of new technology." In pursuing our agricultural goals, we need, we seek, and we confidently expect the continued assistance of the magazines and rural papers affiliated with the Agricultural Publishers Association.

Again, many thanks for your letter and your promise of support in helping agriculture and rural America reach the new horizons for which it strives.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 12, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with these words of Scripture: II Corinthians 4:8: *We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed but not in despair.*

Eternal God, whose visible presence is withdrawn from us, give us a vivid and vital sense of the nearness of Thy Spirit, directing us in the ways of humility, righteousness, and justice.

Grant that the daily record and influence of our life, that we exert upon others, may help them overcome their struggles and sorrows, misfortunes, and miseries.

May the Master be our contemporary and companion in our efforts and enthusiasm to build a better world and a finer civilization to bring peace and good will among men.

We beseech Thee that our living for the Kingdom of God may be more inward and personal and incarnate and pervade our thinking in regard to needy humanity.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 10, 1966, was read and approved.

ELECTION OF CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR., TO BE A MEMBER OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 635 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 635

Resolved, That CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR., of Ohio, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Government Operations.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL SKI WEEK

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Joint Resolution 767 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 767

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the period beginning January 21, 1966, and ending January 30, 1966, as "National Ski Week," in recognition of the economic, recreational, and healthful aspects of the sport of skiing; and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week by participation in appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN TABER

The SPEAKER. Under an order of the House heretofore entered into, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, as I informed the House on Monday, our friend and former colleague, the Honorable John Taber, of Auburn, N.Y., passed away quietly during the recent congressional adjournment period, on November 22, 1965, following a long illness.

Most of the upstate New York district which John Taber served with such great distinction for 40 years in this House, including his home city of Auburn, is now included in the district which I have the honor to represent. He was my immediate predecessor as New York State's "Finger Lakes Congressman." And I am proud to rise today to pay tribute to his long service in this House, and to the forcefulness and integrity which so clearly marked his public career.

Few men or women have served longer in Congress than John Taber served. And few ever stood more consistently or determinedly for the ideals and beliefs which they cherished. I am sure many of us would, in all candor, acknowledge that we did not always agree with John Taber's stands on some of the issues of the day. But I know too that all of us admired the courage and forthrightness with which he expressed his point of

view and worked and defended it, both in the great Committee on Appropriations and here on the floor of this House.

For nearly half a century John Taber was one of the handful of men who are the real leaders of this House. During two Congresses, the 80th and the 83d, he was the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. During the remaining period, until his decision to retire voluntarily from Congress in 1963, he was the ranking minority member of that committee. Other Members can and I know will want to comment more fully than I can do on John Taber's work within that great committee. But I am sure they will agree with me that courage and integrity were among his most outstanding attributes.

Once John Taber had made up his mind what was the right course to follow, he never let any considerations of personal glory, or expediency, or party favor deflect him from that course. He was consistently a firm and solid rock for the principles and ideals of the governmental policy in which he believed. And those ideals in which he did believe he espoused, incidentally, with a fervor and a sense of deep conviction that is all too often lacking in public life today. He was not afraid to go down the line for his convictions. He defended his own views of fiscal responsibility on the floor of this House just as vigorously when the man in the White House was a Republican as when he was a Democrat.

I like to think, Mr. Speaker, that this courage and determination, and this granite forthrightness which John Taber's service here always typified, represent the best in the soil and background of upstate New York from which he sprang. He represented a basically rural district, one that probably had more farm families than almost any other district in the State. His rugged individuality, his insistence on a strict accounting for every public tax dollar spent, his determination to see that unneeded frills and embellishments were eliminated from every Government operation, his insistence that the taxpayer should get a solid dollar of value for every dollar of Government money spent—all these reflected the basic, working creed of those sturdy men and women of rural, upstate New York who for generations had had to wrest their living from a not always friendly soil, and who had never been

able to fall back on anyone to help them over periods of stress and trouble.

Perhaps our views of things have changed a bit in the years since John Taber first took his seat in this House, during the administration of Warren Gamaliel Harding. Perhaps we have become a more complex, a more complicated, a more populous, a more urban, a more harassed, and yes, as the recent power blackout and current transit difficulties in New York City have made so clear, even a more vulnerable nation than we once were back in the simple days of Harding normalcy in 1923. But no matter how much we change, surely those same simple virtues of prudence, of good sense, of thrift, and most of all, of simple courage and integrity for which John Taber stood in this House, will always have their proper place in our public as well as in our private life. And it is good and fitting and proper that we should pause here to remind ourselves once again of that simple truth.

Many of us will remember John Taber as a stern man, almost gruff in fact. There was something in him of the sturdiness and aloofness of the New England Puritan, something of the nonsense silence of the western frontiersman. But I have found over and over again, as I have tried in these past 4 years to serve the people of the Finger Lakes district of New York whom John Taber served so long and so faithfully, that John Taber's gruff exterior really masked a deep concern for the individual problems and difficulties of his neighbors, be they big or small, Republicans or Democrats. Hundreds, thousands, of people in the counties which he represented back home, found that John Taber was never too busy to listen to their problems, never too occupied with the heavy responsibilities of the Committee on Appropriations to put in a word in their behalf with this or with that Government agency. He was a good Congressman to his people, an effective Congressman. He helped keep government close to the people back home, always responsive to their individual needs and problems. He did well the job that all of us have come to realize is such an important part of the responsibilities of every effective Member of this House.

Influential and distinguished as he was in Washington, John Taber never lost touch with the people back home in Auburn. His public career began in this community, as a member of the Board of Supervisors of Cayuga County, representing his own ward in the city of Auburn. And in his 40 years as Congressman and as chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations, his headquarters back home remained a simple, book-lined law office on Auburn's main street, one flight up, which you could reach only by climbing a rather rickety flight of stairs. John Taber was respected back home because he never stopped being an active participant in the life of his own home community. He never lost the common touch, walk as he might with Presidents or with Kings.

Mr. Speaker, John Taber's career was an important part of the unfolding story

of the growth and development of New York State and of this great Nation as a whole. As we enter now upon a new and even more solemn session of this Congress, as we prepare to meet in this chamber tonight to hear the words and recommendations of the President of the United States on the burning issues of war or peace half a world away in the steaming jungles of southeast Asia, perhaps in pausing to remember John Taber we can somehow catch a new awareness of the courage and conviction and steadfastness that have always been typical of the people of New York State and of America in the finest hours of our history.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in late November 1965 the United States lost one of its finest statesmen—a legislator of tremendous ability, a gentleman of the highest standards, a citizen dedicated to the best for his beloved country and all mankind.

Our former colleague, John Taber, from the old 36th District of New York, died on November 22, 1965, in Auburn, N.Y., at the age of 85. In the Congress he was one of my closest personal friends despite a substantial difference in age. My admiration was unlimited for all of his wonderful qualities. John Taber's many kindnesses to me, I deeply appreciated; but in retrospect I will always and especially cherish them because they were words of wisdom, a pat on the back or perhaps a deserved criticism from one of the great legislators of our time.

John Taber's record was one of dedication, forthrightness and service. He served his country in local and Federal Governments for half a century—including 40 years in the House of Representatives. During his entire tenure in this House, he served with highest distinction on the Appropriations Committee, was chairman 4 years in the 80th and 83d Congress, and for many years was the senior Republican. He retired from Congress voluntarily December 31, 1962.

During those 40 years, he developed a reputation as a "fiscal vigilante" because of his undeviating dedication to economy in government. Some people might look at the constant growth of Federal spending and say that Congressman John Taber fought a losing battle for four decades. But one must wonder just how much more Federal spending there would have been if there had not been a John Taber in the Congress as the "watchdog of the Treasury." As an expert in Federal fiscal matters he scrutinized and cut the budgets in his responsibility on the House Appropriations Committee. Administrations from President Roosevelt to President Kennedy knew John Taber was there protecting the taxpayer's interest. And as our good friend, the late Clarence Cannon, himself a fiscal expert on the Committee on Appropriations, once said, "It would be a national calamity if Mr. Taber ever retired."

John Taber by developing the record in committee hearings was able to cut great chunks out of every presidential

budget, and his reductions in the field of foreign aid, which he viewed as a "gravy train," were consistent no matter which President was in the White House. And while he had a passion for economy, he supported the act which created the Marshall plan, occasionally fought cuts in foreign aid, particularly military assistance, opposed lend lease but once the bill was law, voted for the appropriations to make it effective, and voted funds for the Office of Price Administration after OPA became law.

Those of us who were fortunate to know and work with John Taber appreciated what a valiant, able, and truly kindly man he was. I was sad when he retired from the Congress. I was saddened even further to learn of his death for here was a man above men. To his son, Charles, Mrs. Ford and I extend our deepest sympathies.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the New York Times of November 23, 1965, the day following Mr. Taber's death:

EX-REPRESENTATIVE JOHN TABER DIES AT 85; "FISCAL VIGILANTE" LED COMMITTEE—FINGER LAKES CONGRESSMAN SERVED FOR 40 YEARS ON APPROPRIATIONS UNIT

AUBURN, N.Y., November 22.—Former Representative John Taber, a veteran of 40 years in Congress, died today at a nursing home here after a long illness. He was 85 years old.

WATCHDOG ON EXPENDITURES

Perhaps more than anything else, John Taber's nicknames typified his long congressional career.

As the ranking member of the powerful House Appropriations Committee, he was variously known as "the watchdog of the Treasury," John (Cash and Carry) Taber, the "fiscal vigilante" and sarcastically, "Generous John."

During his days on the Hill, the art of cutting pieces and chunks out of the Federal budget became known, in Washington parlance, as "Taberizing."

For 20 consecutive terms, beginning in 1923, John Taber represented the predominantly Republican, generally thrifty and heavily rural Finger Lakes region of western New York. When he retired from Congress on December 31, 1962, his 36th District became part of the reapportioned 35th District.

Mr. Taber was named to the House Appropriations Committee in his first term. He became the ranking member in 1933 and was its chairman in 1947 and again in 1953.

As the chairman, he was one of the most influential men in the Government, and it seemed that Congress was divided into three bodies: the Senate, the House, and John Taber's 43-man committee.

He scrutinized Federal budgets with a vengeance, searching for the smallest extravagance and pouncing on its author when he discovered one. No item was too small for his attention, and he relentlessly insisted that each entry be separately and fully justified.

"We're not going to use a knife to cut down Federal appropriations," he was fond of saying, "we're going to use a sledgehammer."

Cabinet members and department heads who came before his committee stood in awe of his fiscal prowess and credited him with a sixth sense that enabled him to spot any excess in a budget request.

John Taber denied any occult techniques. "I just use simple fifth-grade arithmetic," he once said. "You'd be surprised how much we can save with just a little elementary figuring."

A tall, imposing figure with a deep, rasping voice that penetrated to every part of the House Chamber, he was often accused by his critics of using the committee to block projects not in accord with his conservative views.

During the committee hearings he was a forbidding prosecutor as he grilled witnesses. Once, shortly after the war, a representative of the War Department was asking the committee for funds to build a swimming pool at a hospital only a few miles from Waikiki Beach.

"Tell me General," Mr. Taber rasped, "what makes you think those boys would swim in your expensive pool up on the hill there, when they could go down to Waikiki Beach and see all the beautiful girls?"

The son of Franklin P. and Mary Parker Taber, he was born on May 5, 1880, in Auburn, where he was educated in public schools. After receiving a bachelor of arts degree from Yale in 1902, he studied for a year at the New York Law School and was admitted to the New York bar in 1904.

He then joined his father's law firm of Taber and Brainard in Auburn, where he remained until 1918, when he opened his own practice.

The descendant of three State assemblymen, Mr. Taber plunged into Republican politics in Auburn. He became a member of the Cayuga County Republican Committee and in 1911 was elected a special county judge, a post he held until 1919.

Indirectly, it was Franklin D. Roosevelt, Mr. Taber's archenemy who made it possible for him to become appropriations chairman. In the Roosevelt landslide of 1932, 12 Republican members of the committee were swept out of office, leaving Mr. Taber the ranking minority member.

When Republicans gained control of Congress in 1946, the New Yorker was made chairman. He lasted only one term, until the Democrats regained the House majority in 1948. He was chairman for a second 2-year period after the Republican successes in the 1952 elections.

ENEMY OF GOVERNMENT WORKER

One of his money-saving goals in 1947 was to prune a million persons from the Federal payroll. Roughly 2.2 million persons were employed by the Government at the time, and although he failed, hordes of Government workers were "Taberized" during his reign.

In domestic matters, Mr. Taber vigorously opposed all programs tinged with the New Deal or Fair Deal. During World War II, however, he backed all war appropriations and accepted the administration's foreign policy. After the war he resumed his economic battle and fought to cut back foreign aid.

A member of the Cayuga County and New York State Bar Associations, Mr. Taber was also a Mason and an Elk. He has served as a trustee of the Auburn Trust Co. and as president of the Whitney Point Water Co.

His wife, the former Gertrude Johnson, died January 26. A son, Charles, survives.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, one of the great men of our day passed away during the past adjournment of Congress. The Honorable John Taber died in his home-

town of Auburn, N.Y., on November 22, 1965.

To those of us who knew him personally and served with him in the U.S. Congress, his death is a great personal loss. With his passing, the entire Nation lost a legislator and political leader of great stature who had a profound influence on the financial affairs of this country over a period of two decades.

John Taber was of the Jeffersonian belief that those who are governed least are governed best. He had a Hamiltonian concern for the financial integrity of the Federal Government and the Nation. He often said:

I have always believed people could spend money to better advantage than Government. I have always believed that unless Government is kept out of those fields that people can better exploit for themselves, we will lower our standard of living.

John Taber was born on May 5, 1880 in Auburn, N.Y. He was the son of the late Franklin P. and Mary Parker Taber and was one of four children. It might well be said that his interest in politics was inherited. He was the descendant of three State assemblymen. His great-great-grandfather, Silas Bowker, was a member of the New York State Assembly from 1814-1824. His great-grandfather and grandfather also held State assembly seats.

Mr. Taber was a resident of Auburn all of his life. After graduation from the Auburn public schools, he attended Yale University from which he graduated in 1902. He studied law at New York Law School and was admitted to the New York State bar on November 15, 1904. He then joined his father's law firm of Taber & Brainard until he opened his own law office on January 1, 1918. He was an active member and former vestryman of St. Peters Episcopal Church in Auburn.

John Taber was active in State and National politics for 60 years. At the age of 25—1 year out of law school—he started his political career as supervisor of Auburn's second ward. He later served 8 years—1910 to 1918—as special county judge. His nearly 20 years of service in the local Republican organization earned him the titles "Mr. Republican," "Uncle John," and "Honest John."

Mr. Taber came to Congress—the 68th—in 1923 from the picturesque Finger Lakes region in upstate New York and represented that congressional district for 20 consecutive terms until his voluntary retirement on January 3, 1963. At the time of his retirement he had the longest continuous tenure of any Republican in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Taber was elected to the Committee on Appropriations of the House at the time he came to Congress in 1923. He is the only person to have served a total of 40 years on that committee. He became the ranking Republican on the committee in 1933 and served 30 years as Republican leader of the committee. Twice during this period he served as chairman; in the 80th and the 83d Republican controlled Congresses.

During his chairmanship in the 80th Congress he exerted great leadership in a major drive to balance the budget. Both Republicans and Democrats were surprised by the amount of money he was able to carve out of the President's budget. His 24 years in Congress and as a member of the Committee on Appropriations gave him a thorough knowledge of the workings of the various Government departments. He dug hard and deep for facts to enable the committee to get underneath the surface of budget requests to determine minimum needs. He was hard to convince but was a very fair-minded man in all matters.

During this period the word "Taberize" became part of the Federal jargon, meaning to hack with a meat ax. Also, he began to be known by such labels as "watchdog of the Treasury," "John, 'Cash and Carry' Taber," "Fiscal Vigilante," and "Meat Ax John." He was even facetiously called "Generous John" on occasion.

Mr. Taber once told a reporter during an interview:

Someone once called me "Meat Ax John." But that didn't bother me. Sometimes a meat ax was needed on some of those wasteful requests.

Again in the 83d Congress, he made a major effort to balance the budget. Largely as a result of his dedicated leadership, the Congress was able to reduce the budget in 1954 by nearly \$5 billion. He frequently used to describe his approach to Federal budgets by saying:

We're not going to use a knife to cut down Federal appropriations, we're going to use a sledgehammer.

Mr. Taber was the first chairman of the Joint Budget Committee created by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. While this approach to a balanced budget was never successful, he did his best to make it work. He also was a member of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures for 20 years prior to his retirement. His strong support for the work of this committee was of great value to its chairman, the Honorable Harry Byrd, of Virginia.

Regardless of party, Taber's colleagues in both Houses of Congress admired his honesty, integrity, sincerity, and high sense of public duty. They envied his tenacity and energy. They often accorded him the highest accolade that one politician can bestow upon another: "He always keeps his word."

In a tribute to Mr. Taber on his 75th birthday, former Speaker of the House JOE MARTIN stated:

If there is anyone in this country who deserves the title "watch dog of the Treasury" it is John. During his long service in this House he has saved this country many billions of dollars. Because of his service the taxpayers of America have been saved heavy taxes. He is a man who, regardless of political consequences, never failed to support legislation for the benefit of the country. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 5, 1955.)

On this same occasion, the late Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn paid tribute to Mr. Taber as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I want to join in every kind word that the gentleman from Massachusetts,

Mr. MARTIN, has said with reference to our beloved colleague, John Taber. He has been an outstanding Representative for many, many years. John Taber's word is his bond. I have enjoyed my service with him.

John Taber was a man with unusual qualities of leadership. He had a keen intellect and a rich background of knowledge. He was a person with complete balance and exceptional judgment. He was firm but fair. He was stern but warm and considerate. He was dedicated to his principles but understanding of the viewpoint of others. His ideals were lofty but his approach was earthy. He possessed a keen sense of humor which endeared him to all who knew him.

His personality and qualities of statesmanship grew naturally out of the background that produced him. He came from a district of farms and small towns in western New York. The largest city was his hometown of Auburn. One-third of the people lived on farms. Winters were cold. Foresight and thriftiness were virtues.

John Taber was a great believer in fifth-grade arithmetic. He had little use for the slide rule and higher mathematics. One day he asked a Government witness for a percentage figure. "I don't have my slide rule with me," the budget officer replied. "Wait just a minute," Taber drawled as he pulled out a 3-inch pencil stub, "I'll have it for ye."

In the April 7, 1957 issue of *New Republic*, Eugene Rachlis cited an interesting example of John Taber's unusual ability to carry his point of view to those to whose within the sound of his voice. Mr. Rachlis stated:

In cloakrooms, old-time Representatives recall the day when the sheer power of Taber's voice restored the hearing of a long deaf colleague. No one recalls either the subject under debate, although it must have been appropriations for Taber to have been speaking at all, or the name of the Representative who threw away his hearing aid. But it is said that Taber made one point with such violence that the deaf man, unmindful until then of what was going on, suddenly sat upright, looked around with a most bewildered expression, then turned around and shook hands with an equally bewildered Taber.

The Treasury Daily Statement was Mr. Taber's "bible." He received his copy daily and carried it with him wherever he went. It was not unusual to see him pull the report from his pocket at budget hearings and other committee meetings and quote the contents to other members and departmental witnesses. Resulting economies in Federal expenditures cannot be measured, but there can be no doubt that his influence saved the taxpayers of the Nation tremendous sums of money.

On Mr. Taber's 80th birthday, the late Honorable Clarence Cannon—with whom he served for over 30 years—stated:

I will say this—and I challenge any man to dispute it—if you judge men by the amount they have saved this country, John Taber would get the biggest salary of any man in the country—it is my earnest belief that but for his service the national debt would be at least \$10 billion bigger than it is.

The passing of John Taber, and the death of the late Clarence Cannon in

1964, mark the end of an era in the history of the Congress and the Nation. There are still many in Congress who have the same conservative approach to economy in Government. But the experienced leadership of these two dynamic economy advocates is sorely missed by those of us who have inherited their mantles. The overpowering spending pressures of today's world are almost irresistible. The need for more men like John Taber becomes increasingly great as these pressures expand.

A paragraph contained in the November 24, 1965, issue of *Roll Call*, the newspaper of Capitol Hill, sums it up very well:

It is not easy to say "no" when even the voters seem willing to tolerate continued deficit budgets, but John Taber did so with gusto and conviction. His type will be hard to replace.

Those of us who remain behind to continue his good work will need to draw upon the memory of his constant devotion to his principles and his outstanding record of economy in Government. His wise counsel and courageous leadership will continue to be a source of inspiration and encouragement to all who knew him.

Mr. Taber married the former Gertrude Johnson on April 13, 1929. Mrs. Taber died January 26, 1964, at Auburn Memorial Hospital after a brief illness. He is survived by a son, Charles, of Auburn, and two sisters—Miss Emily Taber of Auburn and Mrs. Amos Thacher of Garden City, Long Island, N.Y.

To them I wish to extend my heartfelt sympathy and condolences. They and all of us have lost one of God's noblemen.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, we were all saddened last November to learn of the passing of the former Republican dean of this House, the Honorable John Taber, of New York. As a fellow New Yorker, I have known and respected him from the time I first became a Member of the House in the 75th Congress.

John Taber's principal concern through most of his congressional career was the execution of public funds. As chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the first postwar Congress and again during the Korean war in the 83d Congress, he devoted himself to the difficult task of supervising the consideration of appropriation bills under two different administrations.

In his 40 years of service as a Member he saw and took part in the development of this country during the post-World War I days of the twenties, the depression of the early thirties, the World War II transformation, and the precarious era of the cold war period. During all those years, he applied himself to his duties with a steadfast determination and single-mindedness of purpose. At the time of his death he had

been a member of the bar of the State of New York for exactly 60 years and 1 week.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from New York in extending to the family and friends of John Taber our sincere condolences.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his kind remarks. I now yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to warmly embrace every kind word and thought expressed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and others here about the late honorable and much beloved John Taber, of New York. He was truly a great American, one of the Nation's great public servants who left his imprint on the public decisions of his time.

John Taber was blessed with an abundance of that great Christian virtue of kindness. The milk of human kindness ran deeply in him.

He was ever fair in dealing with his fellow man; a man of unimpeachable integrity. Speaker Rayburn once said of him that his word was his bond—and it was.

Humility, self-effacement were but two of the hallmarks of this outstanding man. He once remarked, "I'm just an ordinary Congressman"; but he was not.

He had an abiding belief in the proposition that the House of Representatives was the supreme guardian of the peoples liberties and that the power of the purse was the weapon through which to assure their preservation.

Few if any men have erected a more consistent record of public service. Holding an abiding philosophical attachment to the proposition of limited Central Government, he was an apostle of economy in public expenditure all his days here in the Halls of Congress. And he was well-suited to pursuit of this always unpopular course. Of rugged character, his courage was undaunted in the face of the odds and of adversity. He possessed a firmness and perseverance of purpose which nothing but the impossible could divert from its direction. He was motivated by a deep belief in the philosophy of the old Chinese proverb that if you cut your own wood it will warm you twice.

George Washington, the Father of our Country, once remarked that it is incumbent upon every person of every description to contribute to his country's welfare. John Taber not only left no such debt unsettled; he left a large credit balance upon which we and others to come can draw for inspiration and strength.

America can never have too many John Tabers. He was a true patriot in the good old-fashioned inspirational sense of the word. He was my good and always helpful friend. In the words of the Prophet Isaiah, he lifted up a standard for the people of his day. May the Lord bless his memory.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas. I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, certainly I want to add my word of tribute to one of the greatest friends I ever had.

John Taber was already a highly respected, experienced Member of this body when I came here as a freshman in 1935. I could never repay him for his wise counsel, the helping hand he was always willing to offer, and the inspiration of his attitude toward the House of Representatives, which he loved so deeply.

John was a fighter who asked no quarter and gave none.

But his adversaries were worthy opponents—never enemies.

Beneath a gruff exterior was a man of great kindness, and with a delightful sense of humor that could and did come to the surface even when the going was rough and the debate heated.

John Taber left the membership of this great body a rich legacy of dedication to duty, of high competence and a willingness to shoulder far more than his fair share of the arduous committee work that is so vital to the success of the legislative process.

Those of us who worked with John Taber are well aware of the high regard in which he was held by his colleagues as a man of complete integrity.

It was my privilege, on an occasion some years ago, to visit his district and to speak on his behalf.

There I learned firsthand of the respect and honor he enjoyed among the people who sent him, time and again, to represent them in this body.

A truly great American has left the scene after a long and distinguished career of service to his country.

To his bereaved family I extend my sympathies and share its sorrow.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana. I now yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join my friends from the great State of New York in paying tribute to an outstanding former Member of the House. John Taber, in his long and distinguished career, had the honor of presiding over the great Committee on Appropriations and of serving as its ranking Republican member for many years. He was devoted to economy in government and to the American way of life. He was a man of strong will and undisputed integrity. He was a big man in every sense of the word. It was my privilege, which I shall always cherish, to have been a friend and colleague of this noble man and great American.

I extend to his loved ones my deepest sympathy in their grief.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of a great American, Congressman John Taber.

Few men ever served in this House longer or more effectively than our late colleague from New York. Mr. John was a man of great integrity, ability, and courage. His relentless fight for fiscal sanity contributed greatly to the stability and strength of our country and resulted in the saving of many billions of dollars for American taxpayers. This Nation is indeed fortunate that the many talents of this outstanding patriot were devoted for so many years to the best interests of our Government and country.

Mr. Taber's unsurpassed record of devotion to duty and accomplishment will continue to inspire those of us fortunate enough to serve with him and will serve as an excellent example for public servants in the years to come.

I am deeply grieved at the loss of a true and devoted personal friend, but I shall always be grateful that it was my privilege to know him and enjoy his warm friendship and wise counsel.

I extend my deepest sympathy to the members of his family in their bereavement.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, there is no way by which I can possibly express the grief that is mine with the passing of my beloved friend and former colleague, John Taber. No words can convey the personal loss I feel.

Nor is there any way nor any words by which any one of us can so much as presume to add an inch to the stature of this truly great man. His accomplishments as a Member of this body towers high above our reach. They stand as a lasting monument, 40 years in the building, to guide us, to inspire us, and to guide and inspire all who come after us.

There was nothing dramatic about John. He was not given to dramatics. He was not one that radiated enthusiasm. He never became excited, nor did he seek to excite. Many looked upon him as cold, calculating, and unapproachable.

But that was only the impression one might have who did not really know him. Beneath that apparent cold exterior was a warmth, a compassion and an understanding without limits. Those of us who were privileged to work with him and to know him came to recognize that he was a man entirely without pretense and of the highest quality. There are all too few such men.

For something like 25 years I served with him. During this period I came to know him intimately. And I take immeasurable pride in saying that he and I became personal friends. One could not have a friend more loyal than he.

In the fullest sense of the word, John Taber, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and twice its chairman, was the "watchdog" of the Federal Treasury. I do not believe any man served in the Congress who had a more detailed knowledge of the Federal budget than John. Nor do I believe any man did more toward saving tax dollars for the American people. There is no way of ever determining how much waste he

uncovered and how many dollars of unnecessary Federal expenditures he prevented. The figure must be in the billions over the many years he worked with painstaking care on the appropriation bills.

This is a fact of record. In all the years I have served in this body not often has the Congress ended up with not only a balanced budget but a surplus to apply on the national debt. And that was a Congress when John Taber was chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Truly, John has written his name indelibly on the pages of history. He is no longer with us. But he lives. He will live forever in the history of the Congress he loved, and in the minds and hearts of we who loved him, as a statesman, as a man of character, and as a warm personal friend.

I have lost a fine and good friend, and I extend my sincerest sympathy to his family.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

I now yield to the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I join in the tributes which have been paid to a former distinguished Member of this body.

Mr. Speaker, when I first came here, now 25 years ago, John Taber was one of the very first people that I came to know. I was impressed then with his diligence, his knowledge, his dedication, his hard work, his integrity, and his devotion to duty.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the years that we served together I would say that those attributes were the ones that distinguished him as a Member of this great body.

The country is a greater country because John Taber served here, and as the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], my colleague, the minority whip, said, his exterior may have been cold but he had a warm heart and an understanding sympathetic personality.

Mr. Speaker, I was honored to number him a friend.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York, the senior Republican Member from that great State [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, as dean of the New York Republican delegation, I wish to join my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], in his remarks here this afternoon.

In 1953, when I first came to this Congress, John Taber of my own State of New York was the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. To a freshman Congressman, he was a powerful and imposing man.

I had not known John Taber personally until then except by reputation. He was a man of great legislative and administrative ability. He brought a rarely matched skill and dedication to his job. As chairman and later ranking minority

member of the Appropriations Committee, he was a valiant watchdog of the Treasury, saving countless millions of dollars from waste during his many years in the House.

John Taber will be missed. He has been missed since his retirement. This House and this country can always use men like John Taber. Unfortunately, we always have too few of them.

I am proud that John Taber was a son of the State of New York. New York can be proud of his 40 years of service in the Congress. They were years of achievement—they were years of dedication. Not only will we, in Congress, miss him but he will be a great loss to this Nation and to New York State.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to join with the gentleman from New York and others in paying this deserved tribute to the memory of a beloved colleague and expressing our high regard for him.

When I was first elected to the 83d Congress in a special election, John Taber was the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

After my election to the Committee on Appropriations and for the remainder of John Taber's congressional service, I served on the Committee on Appropriations with him while he was ranking minority member. As a member of the committee and of the House of Representatives, I had the opportunity to come to know him and know him well.

To know him was to have a very high regard and respect for him. I admired his courage, his ability, his integrity, and the intense loyalty that he demonstrated as an able, and patriotic American.

This country is better because of his service. This country is poorer because he is no longer with us as a Member of this House. But his influence will be felt and he will be remembered as long as there remains in the House of Representatives a single Member who served with him and who came to know and to respect him.

The fiscal policy and stature of this country increased greatly during the period of John Taber's almost 40 years of service. During that time he saw an annual budget exceed the combined total of the budgets for the first dozen years of his service as a Representative in the Congress.

John Taber's regard for and recognition of his responsibilities as a Member of this legislative body and to the American people increased with each year of his service and increased in proportion to the increase in the amount involved in the annual appropriation bills enacted by the Congress.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is with deep reverence and with a sincere high regard for the memory of this departed Member that my family and I extend to his family and his friends, our deepest sympathy in the loss of their loved one, this great American.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman for his very eloquent remarks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I join my colleagues today to pay my tribute to the memory of one of the greatest Americans of this century, the late John Taber.

After a long and distinguished service in this body, with a record for fiscal responsibility which has been unmatched in this century, Mr. Taber voluntarily retired to private life hoping to enjoy some years of relaxation free from the constant pressures of office which have steadily mounted in recent years. Alas, it was not to be. After only a few short years in private life, the grim reaper paid his call and Mr. Taber was denied the opportunity to enjoy for long the retirement he so richly deserved following almost a lifetime of dedicated service to his Nation in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Staunch defender of the free enterprise system, valiant fighter for fiscal responsibility, implacable enemy of waste and extravagance, John Taber has left for posterity a monument more lasting than bronze.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY].

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, last November 22, this body lost one of its most distinguished former Members and the citizens of central New York lost one of their most outstanding public servants.

John Taber, who represented the congressional district adjacent to my own, served in the House of Representatives for 40 years. While it was not my privilege to serve with him, I knew of his dedication to the needs of his constituents in central New York. His name was a household word in our area.

At the time of his resignation, in 1962, he was the ranking Republican on the Appropriations Committee. Though he was an avid stalwart of his party, he always put his country ahead of partisan gain and in so doing won the respect and confidence of his colleagues.

John Taber's voice is silent now, but the memory of this dedicated man will live on in central New York as long as decency and honor remain a part of our value system.

I join his successor, Congressman SAM STRATTON, in saluting the memory of John Taber and I extend my deepest sympathies to his family.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying this deserved tribute to our late colleague, John S. Taber.

I had the honor and privilege to serve with Congressman Taber on the Committee on Appropriations for a number of years before his retirement. I recall coming to the 83d Congress, being appointed to that committee, and making his acquaintance. As time went by I observed that one could not help but have a

greater respect each year for his ability, his integrity, and his knowledge of the fiscal situation in our country.

I was always amazed at the wonderful liaison that took place between John Taber, when he was chairman or minority member of that committee, and our late colleague, Clarence Cannon, who also served on that committee. I think we had at that time an example of one of the finest liaisons between the two sides of the House and, between the two ranking members of the Committee on Appropriations. In the long run I think it was good for our country that that wonderful relationship took place.

Our country has lost a wonderful man, a man who has made a great contribution to the welfare of this country. His service in the Congress is missed, and I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. STRATTON. I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBISON].

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our late departed friend and colleague, the Honorable John Taber, of Auburn, N.Y.

Although the phrase has been often used, and in differing ways, I believe it was Henry Clay, also a former Member of this body, who first reminded us that:

Government is a trust, and the officers of the government are trustees; and both the trust and the trustees are created for the benefit of the people.

In my own memory of John Taber, it is probably this facet of his public career—that is, his own personal idea about the approach a public servant should take toward his task—that will remain in my mind, for, in every possible sense of the word, John Taber considered himself a "trustee," and all the several public offices that he held at various times as being "trusteeships" for the people he served, and served so well.

His was truly a distinguished career of public service. Born at Auburn in 1880, educated at Yale, and admitted to the New York State Bar Association in 1904, in the following year he became the supervisor of his township and, thus, a member of the Cayuga County Board of Supervisors. Learned and respected in the law, he moved on in 1910 to become Cayuga County's special judge, a post he held through 1918.

Active also in political affairs, he was a delegate to the National Republican Conventions in 1920, 1924, and again in 1936, and in addition was the chairman of his own county's Republican committee from 1920 to 1925.

First elected to this House of Representatives in November of 1922, he served herein from March 4, 1923, until his retirement at the end of the 87th Congress in late 1962.

His first committee assignment—most unusual as all of us know for any first-termer—was to the Committee on Appropriations, and this was his only major committee assignment, here, during the ensuing 40 years. In that period of time, John Taber saw great changes come about in the nature of his responsibilities as he witnessed the growth of our

annual Federal budget from \$3,748 million in 1923, to close to \$100 billion by the end of his years of service.

John Taber was deeply concerned by this trend, and by the manner in which—at least in his view—the Congress, itself, seemed to gradually lose its control over the budgetary process. To many, John Taber's views, here, were old-fashioned, and, from that viewpoint, his critics were sometimes numerous, but all of them had always the utmost respect for Mr. Taber, and for his knowledge as an articulate and outspoken fighter for what he considered to be the demands of fiscal responsibility.

They all had, too—as did all of us who were privileged to work with and to know him—constant admiration for his integrity, and the depth of his honesty.

And this was appropriate, for to John Taber, as to Benjamin Cardozo, who put it this way:

A trustee is held to something stricter than the morals of the marketplace. Not honesty alone, but the punctilio of an honor the most sensitive, is then the standard of behavior.

It was this kind of character that Mr. Taber brought to his work as a member of the great Committee on Appropriations of this body, of which committee he served as chairman in both the 80th and 83d Congresses, and as ranking minority member from 1935 on in all other Congresses prior to his retirement.

I think it can accurately and fairly be said, without fear of contradiction, that John Taber was one of the great Members of this body, and that his voice was one of the strongest voices ever raised in this chamber. This body—and this Nation—was the better for his service to the people he trusted, and who had trust in him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to our beloved Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, when we talk about John Taber we talk about not only one of the great Americans of all time but also one of the great legislators of our Nation's history.

John Taber always served in this body in accordance with his fixed beliefs, his views on legislation, and he always served according to character.

Between us there developed a very strong and close friendship, a friendship which I treasured in life and the memory of which I shall always treasure as long as I live.

Members have heard me on a number of occasions refer to the importance of friendship not only in the journey of life but particularly in a legislative body. I have repeatedly said to friends of mine that the middle aisle means nothing so far as friendship is concerned and that friendship transcends party and political considerations.

As a Democrat I would never ask a Republican friend of mine, on the basis of friendship, to do something which was contrary to a fixed policy of his party. But there are many things which come within the realm of friendship—many intangibles—and the limitations of party

principle or position are very small in area.

In the journey of life which we take with each other, where respect and friendship for each other exist without regard to the middle aisle, I see no middle aisle where friendship is involved, when I can at any time be of assistance to a colleague of mine.

Why do I refer to this when I talk about John Taber? It brings back to my memory something that happened during the fourth term of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and it involved another great and dear friend of mine who has taken the journey into the Great Beyond. My colleagues who served with him will remember him as another great American and another great legislator, Bill Ditter, of Pennsylvania. What a man he was. What men both of them were.

F.D.R. had sent up an appropriation for some agency, the head of which was getting headlines in unpopularity at the time. I believe it involved some \$18 million on a regular appropriation bill, and the Committee on Appropriations cut out the \$18 million. The time was ripe. The emotionalism existed. The head of the agency and the agency were going through a period of pain and travail, which occasionally happens without regard to what administration might be in power. So the \$18 million was not appropriated.

I was at the White House one night after F.D.R. arrived back from one of his last trips abroad—I believe it was his last trip, as a matter of fact—and the head of the agency was talking with the President. Everybody was around the President. He saw me. He said, "John, come here." I supposed that the President wanted to transfer this conversation to me, and I did not blame him. He said to me, "So-and-so"—and called him by his first name—"Has a problem. I sent up a request for \$18 million and the Congress cut it out. I am going to send up a supplemental appropriation request. I should like to have you get it in the bill. I should like to have it in the supplemental bill."

I said, "I will do what I can, Mr. President." And he said, "I will leave it up to you."

I have served many years in the Congress. I have learned a little from this experience. I am practical, at least. I do not know everything, but I try to learn a little from my contacts with my friends and my colleagues.

I sent for John Taber and for Bill Ditter, and I said: "The 'Great White Chief' at the White House spoke to me yesterday, and I will tell you what he said. He said, 'John, I want you to get this appropriation through.' And I said to them, 'I want to show the President I can do it. That is all. Now you are my pals and you are my friends, and friendship, as you and I know, is a two-way street. This is no policy in your party. I do not know how you are going to do it. I am not going to speak to anyone else on the committee about it. I do not know how you are going to do it, but I would like to have you do it.'"

So, 3 or 4 weeks went by. They held hearings, and so forth. It is in my mind

now that one day John Taber and Bill Ditter met me in the hallway coming, apparently, from the Committee on Appropriations. Well, you remember how John would have his head down when he was talking with you. He called me and motioned to me and said, "John," and you know how he would talk. He said, "John, you remember that appropriation matter you talked to Bill and me about?" I said, "Yes. Sad news?" He said, "Well, John, we could not give the \$18 million. All we could do, John, was \$17,750,000."

Now, those are memories. JOHN McCORMACK never forgets those things. When we are talking about John Taber it brings my mind back to this incident. It is one of the memories of friendship and respect. John Taber was my dear friend. My thoughts of him today and my remarks are not only of him as a colleague but as more than that, a dear and valued friend of mine. I think John Taber, if he could speak to us from beyond the Great Divide, would be happy that I made reference to that incident showing the meaning and significance of friendship among us in the journey of life.

I join with my colleagues from New York, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, in expressing my deep sympathy on the passing of our dear friend and in extending to his son my profound sympathy.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker of the House for those remarks. I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from New York, the successor to the great John Taber, yielding to me. I had the experience of serving as a subcommittee chairman under John Taber, and I think it bespeaks the rapid transition in which we all pass here in this Chamber, that as I look about me I see no other Republican Member of the present House of Representatives who can make that statement. So fast has the chain of events moved, and so fast have the characters changed on this floor of the House of Representatives in the past few years.

As our beloved Speaker just said, John Taber was often referred to in the press and elsewhere as a rather crusty character. Yet I know of no one who had a real sense of human kindness closer to his heart than did John Taber. I know of no one who, in spite of great responsibilities that he bore, when he was alternating, in the years that I served here before, with Clarence Cannon in chairmanship this great Committee on Appropriations, was more anxious to be helpful to his junior colleagues. In the 83d Congress when John Taber resumed the chairmanship of that great committee, I remember how anxious he was to provide a spot or a group of spots on this committee to some of the promising newcomers here in the House of Representatives. His love of tradition was not such that there was any hidebound attitude which prevented him from providing opportunities for those who did come here in their first initiation into this body.

It was at that time in the 83d Congress that for the first time anyone then here could recall—and I do not know of any comparable circumstances since—when there were six Republican freshmen Members of the House of Representatives who were given places on that great Committee on Appropriations. Among those were our colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], who now stands as the second ranking Republican on that committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], who now serves as the chairman of our conference, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], who now serves in the other body. I can recall that John Taber asked only one question. I happened to be sitting in his office as he made a number of telephone calls, as he put it, "to check out some of these freshmen." He asked only one question, "Will they stand up?" That is all he asked of the people whose opinion he wanted to get with respect to the placement of these six newcomers on that great committee.

I had the pleasure of knowing his son, Chuck, who served him in such a devoted fashion while John was here in the House. I know Chuck must feel very much alone these days with his mother and dad both gone. I hope he will take some comfort and a measure of great pride in having the opportunity to read this RECORD tomorrow and gain therefrom some measure of the great pride that all of us felt who had an opportunity to serve with John Taber on this great Committee on Appropriations, and particularly to serve under his chairmanship and to feel the great esteem in which he is held by his former colleagues on both sides of the aisle and all those who served with him here in this great House of Representatives.

I thank the present incumbent of the seat that John Taber held so long and so proudly, for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin for his very eloquent tribute.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE].

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, the death of our beloved former colleague, John Taber, saddens all who knew him. His long and distinguished service on the Appropriations Committee, of which he twice acted as chairman, made him an acknowledged expert in governmental fiscal matters. To this task, he brought personal convictions to which he remained faithful throughout his 40 years in the Congress. Economy and efficiency were objectives he truly sought. His dogged determination brought him national recognition as a real champion of sound operating practices.

He loved this country and worked hard to preserve its greatness. Although he had a gruff exterior, those close to him appreciated his sensitivity and relied on his sympathetic understanding. He was eminently fair in his judgments and charitable in his attitudes. Yes, John

was truly a true friend and a thorough gentleman.

The real strength of government lies in the character of its leadership and men like John Taber are always needed on the national scene. He set a high standard of public service which grateful constituents and admiring colleagues will long remember. This great legislator reflected real credit upon his State of New York and the Congress.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] for yielding to me and I take this time to likewise join with my colleagues who have paid tribute to the memory of John Taber, who was one of the great stalwarts of the House of Representatives and who was beloved by those who had the privilege of serving with him here in the House of Representatives and by those he served through his long public career.

Although I am well aware that he lived a long and full life, I confess to a sense of deep personal loss at his passing, a sense of loss that remains vivid because I admired him so much, and because I continue to receive expressions of regard for him from his former constituents in Wayne County, now part of the 36th District of New York which I have the honor to represent.

For 20 consecutive terms John Taber represented in the House the beautiful Finger Lakes region of western New York. He was named to the House Appropriations Committee in his first term. He became the ranking minority member in 1933, and became the committee's chairman in the Congresses that began in 1947 and 1953—the 80th and the 83d. His service was monumental in scope, depth, and quality. It was one of the greatest examples of fiscal integrity and fiscal responsibility ever demonstrated by a Member of Congress charged with the awesome duties incident to the congressional power of the purse.

He scrutinized Federal budgets with extraordinary care. No item was too small for his attention, and he relentlessly insisted that each entry be separately and fully justified. Cabinet members and heads of executive departments who came before him stood in awe of his fiscal prowess. They credited him with a sixth sense that enabled him to discover any excess in a budget request.

The finest memorial to this great man and to his achievement as a Member of Congress is a steady adherence to the cause to which his life was dedicated; the sound management of the public funds, the people's contributions in taxes to their Government.

Mr. Speaker, parenthetically, I might add that when I first went to New York State—my wife's family was from the small town of Interlaken, N.Y., which was located in the congressional district represented by the gentleman from New York, Mr. Taber—I learned firsthand of the great service he was rendering to his constituents in that congressional district.

Also, I had the privilege of following the career of the late great John Taber while I attended Cornell University Law School in Ithaca, N.Y., and then later when I moved to Rochester, N.Y., the area which it is now my privilege to serve in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the important contribution that I can make to the remarks that have been made here today is this: I have the privilege of representing the 36th Congressional District which includes the County of Wayne, which at one time was a part of the congressional district represented by the late John Taber in this House of Representatives. Even today as I make my rounds in Wayne County I hear many great things about John Taber and the representation that he rendered that county and that congressional district while he served here in the House of Representatives.

So, Mr. Speaker, I join here today in paying tribute and respect to the memory of John Taber, and extend to his son my deepest sympathy.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with mixed emotion—sadness over the loss of a former colleague, and pride in having served with him.

Former Congressman John Taber lived a long and very useful life. I am sure that prior to his death at age 85 he spent many days in retrospect, thinking of the things he had seen and things he had done.

John Taber and I did not agree in our political philosophy but he was sincere and dedicated in his beliefs.

And, as a great advocate of economy in our Government he served a very useful purpose. He was often criticized for cuts he made in appropriation measures. But again, I must say that men of his political views are absolutely necessary in our Government.

John Taber was an expert in his field. He had unlimited knowledge of Government activities and expenditures. He knew all the techniques of budget preparation; of investigations and hearings; and he was a master at reaching agreements in conference.

As a young, junior Democrat I had the opportunity several times to sit beside Mr. Taber, as a senior Republican, in conference committees. And I must say that his advice was always good.

He served many years in Congress and left his imprint here in many ways.

I extend my sympathy to his family but offer them consolation in the thought of the worthwhile life John Taber led and of the great service he rendered to his Government and to his country.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I can add anything to the fine tributes from so many of my colleagues to our greatly beloved former colleague and good friend, John Taber. But I

surely want to add my voice to the accolades on his behalf today.

I always refer to Chairman Taber as "Mister John." It has been my pleasure to have worked with him in excess of 20 years on the Committee on Appropriations, so I think I can appraise him accurately. Men do not come any finer. By any yardstick used to measure him, Mr. John was a big, outstanding man. He has wielded a great influence in the Congress for sound fiscal policy and measures. His influence will endure.

Everyone who ever knew him will attest to his honesty, his integrity, his sincerity, and high sense of public duty. Mr. John was a big man—big in so many ways—big in heart—big in dedication to his country—big to the high purposes he devotedly served.

Mr. John was a kind man, an able man, a greatly beloved and respected man. His big voice in the Halls of Congress will continue to ring in our memories and in our hearts. His objectives were noble. His goals will continue as a heritage for our Nation in future generations. He was a great friend and we are all saddened by his passing.

I join with all my colleagues in extending to his son, Charles, his sisters, and every member of his wide circle of friends and loved ones our heartfelt sympathy, our sorrow at their great loss, and our appreciation for a job well done by Mr. John.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN TABER

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to have served with John Taber on the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee for a number of years. While we did not always agree 100 percent on all matters, our relationship was always close and cordial, and my admiration for him continued to increase as we worked together through the years. He was always fair and considerate in his approach to committee affairs, and as the late Speaker Rayburn once said, "His word was his bond." He was a man you could always trust.

During his 40 years of service in the Congress and as a leading member of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Taber never varied from his belief that Government expenditures must be curtailed wherever possible to maintain the financial integrity of the Nation. He dedicated his intelligence, his ability, and his energy to the proposition that Federal budgets should be reduced wherever and whenever possible to the barest minimum necessary to meet the public need.

He once stated on the floor of the House:

I appreciate that mine is perhaps a lone voice in the wilderness, but I am expressing the sentiment and issuing a warning that I believe needs to be issued to all America at the present time. That warning is to balance our budget or face disaster.

While many of us—I suppose we should say a majority of us—regarded his views on general fiscal policy in the later years as somewhat dated, all of us who knew him and worked with him always admired and respected the depth of his convictions and the breadth of his devotion to the pursuit of what he saw

as the public interest. Never once did I see Mr. Taber put self-interest above the national interest—nor do I believe he ever did. As has so well been said, America can never have too many John Tabers.

I consider it a great privilege to have served with John Taber. I consider it a great honor to have been included among his friends. His passing was a great loss to all of us who knew him well, as well as to the people of this great Nation.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, we gather at this hour in this hallowed House Chamber to honor a departed colleague, the Honorable John Taber, who passed away last November 22 in his home at Auburn, N.Y.

Later today every seat in this Chamber will be filled, every chair in this balcony will be occupied as we gather to listen to the President deliver his state of the Union message. The klieg lights will blaze, the television cameras will instantly carry the Presidential image to the Nation and the radio microphones will record every word for the waiting public.

The atmosphere of this evening will be quite different from the scene that greets us at this moment as we quietly and reverently pay tribute to a departed patriot. Not that John Taber would have wanted the hoopla of a television performance or a joint session of the Congress, but his accomplishments and contributions to America certainly warrant such treatment.

One thing is certain. John Taber would have been intensely interested in the state of the Union message we will receive today. He would have been keenly aware of the problems facing our Nation. He would have listened intently for clues to the budget message that will be received later this month.

This one-time chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations had a tremendous grasp of the fiscal problems facing the Nation and was a vigorous protector of the people's resources. Those of us who now serve on the Appropriations Committee cannot help but reflect on the principles and accomplishments of this former chairman. Perhaps John Taber's approach to fiscal problems can best be described as soundly conservative. His efforts saved the American taxpayers untold billions of dollars, but a really deserving project or request never floundered for lack of funds. It is well for us to recall the life of John Taber as we now tackle the sober problems of financing a war and putting pyramiding domestic spending in proper perspective.

John Taber knew that no government can long endure by spending more than it receives or by delaying payments to some future time. As a member and chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and as a member of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, John Taber contributed greatly to the well-being of his Nation and his people. We owe him a tremendous debt of gratitude and can only repay that debt by following his example as we approach the grave problems facing our Republic.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for an opportunity to pay my respects to the late Congressman John Taber, of New York. John Taber was a Member of great power and distinction in this body. He served with dedication through some 36 years, during many of which he was either chairman or ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Taber and I disagreed on many issues. We stood on opposite sides of the fence on a substantial proportion of the major questions of the day. But he was a man of integrity who fought hard and openly for that in which he believed.

He was a politician of the old school and he was respected for it.

I join with my colleagues who mourn the passing of John Taber and I extend my condolences to his survivors.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly saddened by the passing of my friend of long standing and our very distinguished former colleague, the able, distinguished gentleman from New York, Hon. John Taber.

Congressman Taber served with outstanding distinction in this body for many years. During his service, he made a memorable record here, not only as a great, devoted, and respected leader of the Appropriations Committee, but as a great American, faithfully, earnestly, and ably serving our country.

I thought a great deal of John Taber. He was a sound, solid, devoted public servant. He was rugged of character and conviction, irrevocably committed to free American institutions.

He had a keen, alert mind and was an untiring, deeply dedicated worker.

While he was very considerate of others, he expected others to be considerate of him. He was invariably willing to listen to the appeals of others, even though he did not agree with them.

He was a keen, able debater, and at times a dynamic debater, and he did not hesitate to express his views with force and conviction.

He was a man of exceptional vigor of expression and resolution of purpose.

John Taber was a dear friend of mine, and I had occasion to talk with him on numerous occasions about legislative and governmental matters, and I always found him to be reasonable and generous and willing to go out of his way to be helpful.

I held John Taber in highest esteem and regarded him as one of the finest Americans I have known. The records of this body are replete with evidence of his splendid service, his leadership, his accomplishments, his devotion to duty, and he will long be remembered here.

In my mind and heart, I will always carry with me some of the most happy recollections and fondest memories of this great son of the State of New York who served here for so many years as the conscientious devoted servant of the Nation.

I am very sorry and greatly saddened, indeed, to learn of the passing of this great American and I tender to his family my most heartfelt sympathy for the loss of such dearly beloved one and such a fine public servant and patriot who served his district and his country with

honor, distinction, and achievement for so many years.

We will always remember John Taber because he was a valued friend, an outstanding Congressman and a great American.

May the good Lord bless and keep him in His eternal home.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the late Representative John Taber rendered long and valuable service to this Nation.

Through the years, as chairman and ranking minority member of the House Appropriations Committee, he was a stalwart in the ranks of the conservatives. He abhorred wasteful spending and never ceased to oppose the increasing and unmanageable Federal debt.

It was with great regret that I witnessed his voluntary retirement from the House of Representatives, and it was with a feeling of personal loss that I learned of his death.

Mrs. Gross joins me in extending sympathy to Mrs. Taber and other members of the family.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to join today in paying my deepest respect to the memory of our former colleague and friend, the late John Taber, of New York.

Mr. Taber served with great distinction for many years on the House Committee on Appropriations and it was my privilege to serve with him on the committee from 1958 until his retirement at the close of the 87th Congress.

He was extremely able and had an outstanding amount of knowledge about the operations of government. His reputation as a staunch fighter for fiscal responsibility and economy in government was both widely known and richly deserved.

John Taber's contributions and accomplishments were many. Our Nation is better off for his having served so conscientiously and well in the House of Representatives.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late John Taber, who so ably represented the State of New York in the Congress for almost 40 years.

John Taber was an outstanding legislator with a deep sense of fiscal responsibility. A man of good judgment, he had firm convictions and the courage to stand behind those convictions. He was blessed with the ability to express his thoughts with great clarity.

With his retirement in 1962 the American people lost one of their ablest public servants and the Congress lost one of its most effective lawmakers.

I will never forget John Taber. When I came to the House of Representatives in 1953, John was chairman of the Appropriations Committee, holding one of the most responsible and time-consuming positions of the House. I learned quickly just how considerate he was to freshmen Members. He always had the time and was always willing to counsel the junior Members. Even though we were of opposite political faiths, he was very helpful to me. I valued his friendship most highly.

To his son, Mrs. Haley and I extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the fine service and to the long years of dedication to the House of Representatives rendered by our former colleague, John Taber.

Many great and distinguished men have served in the Congress of the United States from New York, but I know of no man more dedicated to his own State and to his country. John Taber was a legislator who served the public interest with all the strength and capacity at his command. His sense of conviction, his purpose, and his understanding won the respect and admiration of his colleagues and the gratitude of his constituents. It was a great honor to have served with him and to have been numbered among his friends.

Mrs. King and I express to his family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, death removed one of this century's legislative giants when it claimed our former colleague, the Honorable John Taber, at the age of 85 last fall.

One of the most proud moments of my 11 years on Capitol Hill was the January day in 1959 when I learned I had been named to serve under Mr. Taber on the powerful House Committee on Appropriations. He had become a virtual legend in his own time for the depth and breadth of his fiscal knowledge. He served as chairman of the committee during the 80th and 83d Congresses and was ranking minority member at the time I was appointed.

There have been few minds as keen as John Taber's and no newcomer to the complex activities of the Appropriations Committee could have asked for a more brilliant counselor. I shall always be grateful for the courtesy and patience he showed me during my early days on the committee and for the guidance he generously continued to give me during the succeeding years. When he retired at the close of the 87th Congress, in 1962, he had given 40 years of his life to public service in the House of Representatives, and had saved the taxpayers literally billions of dollars in that time.

He now has joined the ranks of illustrious Appropriations chairmen whose memories are a continued inspiration to those of us who have been privileged to serve under them.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that John Taber was a man of great integrity and that he had a deep sense of fiscal responsibility. For these qualities he will be long remembered, not only among his colleagues but also former ones. He will always occupy a spot of special regard, however, for his lesser known qualities of humor and charity among his closer friends. His many years of service in the House elevated him to the top spot on the Appropriations Committee where he served conscientiously and vigorously. As much as I admired his fiscal capability, I will always remember him with fondness for his delightful qualities as well. He was indeed a great American of whom we can be very proud.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of the pass-

ing of my good friend and distinguished former colleague, John Taber, of New York, during our adjournment period.

As a freshman Congressman in the 83d Congress, no man did more to help me learn and understand the workings of the Congress. His guiding hand was an inspiration to me in my early years as a Member of this body.

It was my privilege to serve with John Taber on the Appropriations Committee for the first 10 years of my service here in the Congress, and I shall always look back on those years and on John Taber's influence with a fond memory of what he meant to me and to all his colleagues in the Congress. No Member of Congress has had greater influence on me or been as helpful to me as John Taber.

Mr. Speaker, John Taber has been sorely missed in the Congress since he retired in 1962. He will now be sorely missed by the thousands who knew and loved this man who exemplified all that is good and fine in a Member of Congress.

I would like to express my deepest sympathies to the family of John Taber and to his many friends who will always remember him as a great Member of Congress, an outstanding American leader, and a true friend.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, Congressman Taber left a great heritage to his family and to our country—for he was a man of courage and character, of tremendous ability, which he always used for the public good. From the first day of my service with him here he manifested a personal interest in me and my efforts and he never failed to exemplify kindness to all who knew him. Our country is stronger because of his battles for fiscal soundness and for the other battles he waged for our benefit.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, John Taber, Clarence Cannon, and I came to Congress together. We were Members of the 68th Congress. Clarence Cannon has gone to his rest and now John Taber follows. Thus, in their passing there is for me more than a tinge of sadness. We had shared many memories and lived through much of the same history.

John Taber brought to bear upon his work the highest integrity of purpose and conviction. Throughout his years in Congress he placed always first the welfare of the Nation. He never ceased to do battle against extravagance and unwarranted spending. His constituency had every reason to love him and it did, and repeatedly sent him back to Congress until he retired.

John Taber left an indelible mark upon the tablets of history of this body. Public service at best is often arduous and wearisome, but nevertheless rewarding. We who knew and loved John Taber will not subscribe to the cynicism of "The evil that men do lives after them; the good is oft interred with their bones." The good he did is not interred with his bones. It will remain forever a part of the greatness of this country.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the late John Taber's great pride was the Committee on Appropriations. He was a real friend to every Member who served on that committee, but I suppose

it was a natural development that he should take particular interest in Republican Members who developed under his tutelage. He was solicitous for our welfare, and tried to give the opinions and desires of each of us all the consideration they deserved.

Although it is well known that Mr. Taber was an avid cutter of budgets, his feeling of reverence for the Congress of the United States and his fine sense of patriotism often caused him to prepare appropriations for purposes which he did not approve. I do not imagine any Member liked our programs of foreign aid any less than did John Taber. However, when the Congress authorized a program for foreign aid, Mr. Taber proceeded to fund it to the best of his ability. He was the first chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, serving in that capacity while chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations in the 80th Congress. Mr. Taber was a member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations until he retired from this body.

The guidance which John Taber gave to the various departments and bureaus during the appropriations process have caused him to do their work better and with less expense to the taxpayer than they would otherwise have done. Our Government is more efficient, and the taxpayer is certainly better off, because John Taber was willing to be a watchdog of the Treasury and an implacable enemy of bureaucratic waste.

In his passing the United States has lost a fine citizen and the State of New York has lost an able and devoted son. Many people, both here and in his home, have lost a loyal and devoted friend. Mrs. Rhodes joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to his family.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, although the Honorable John Taber left our ranks several years ago, he has been remembered with fond and vivid memories.

Now as we gather to pay tribute to his memory, I must note not only his fiery stands in the House but his judicial and legislative service to his loyal constituency. The voters of the former 38th District of the State of New York brought John Taber back to the House of Representatives again and again for 20 consecutive terms and he served under the leadership of 7 different Presidents.

As ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Appropriations, he performed a vital national service by advocating and fighting for a conservative fiscal policy. The era of his leadership was noteworthy as a stimulant to the two-party system of Government.

A strong man, a good man, a man concerned with the security of our country, his spirit is indeed missed in these chambers.

It is with pride that I acknowledge the virtues of this great New Yorker and look back with gratification on being one of his associates and colleagues.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that we in Congress pay tribute today to the memory of a distinguished gentleman, our former colleague, the Honorable John Taber, who represented

the 36th District of New York for 40 years before his retirement.

It was with profound sorrow that I learned of his death last fall.

Congressman Taber was a courageous man, one who was not afraid to stand alone if necessary. He was a forthright man and an honest man. It was my rare privilege to serve with him in the 86th and 87th Congresses. I was tremendously impressed by his remarkable abilities, and his intimate knowledge of the intricacies of the Federal budget.

Congressman Taber was indeed an inspiring example of political service.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most able, conscientious, and influential Members of this House when I first came to Congress was the late John Taber, of New York. He had a wonderful grasp of government and complete courage to vote his convictions.

When he retired in 1962, it was because he did not feel able to continue, physically and mentally, to carry out his responsibilities. This was a real loss to the House and to the country, but I felt he was right, because he knew he was unable to carry on as he had done when he was a younger man.

Personally, I learned a great deal from John Taber, but most of all, I admired his integrity. His courage and example will always be an inspiration to me. He was a truly great man and I and many others are better for having been associated with him.

Mr. Speaker, one thing I recall about John Taber was his human understanding and warmth under a gruff exterior. Another quality I remember about him was that when he knew he did not have the votes to prevail, he did not complain or capitulate. Instead, he made his argument and then accepted defeat in good humor.

Today, much of my viewpoint and many of the opinions I express are the result of listening to John Taber. He was no orator, but he had the figures and could forcefully defend his position. He was always highly respected by Members on both sides of the aisle.

His collaboration and long friendship and association with the late Clarence Cannon, of Missouri, was widely known and served as a wholesome influence in maintaining good legislative procedure.

As it must to all of us, death came to John Taber. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us try to emulate his fine record on behalf of the Nation and fiscal understanding.

I was greatly distressed to read of his death, but his work was done—and well done—so, in spite of sorrow and a sense of loss, those of us who knew him, it seems to me, should emphasize how fortunate we were. For that, we are all thankful. John Taber is at rest and his problems are over; we are thankful for that, too.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join today the other Members of this House and pay tribute to the memory of John Taber who served this Nation long and served this Nation most effectively for over 40 years.

Congressman Taber was one of the most respected Members of the House Appropriations Committee and he was

also considered as one of the watchdogs of the U.S. Treasury.

Even after his retirement he continued to speak in defense of the ideas in which he believed so thoroughly.

His steadfastness, courage, integrity, and a deep sense of responsibility to the American taxpayer will always be remembered.

I extend my deepest and sincerest sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of the Honorable John Taber, of New York. I knew John Taber for almost 20 of the 40 years he served here in this House. I particularly came to know him through my service on the House Committee on Appropriations of which he was a member of 39 years. While I must admit that on many an occasion we differed markedly on policy I must at the same time salute his lifetime goal—efficient and economic government for the benefit of the taxpayers and country as a whole. In the years that I had the honor of serving with John Taber on the Appropriations Committee, I also came to know him not as the gruff, angry man as the press so often likes to depict what it calls congressional "watchdogs," but rather as a fine, warm, friendly, and considerate man.

When John Taber resigned from the House of Representatives in 1962 after 40 years of service, the loss was felt not only by the people of his district in New York, but by every Member of this body—regardless of which side of the aisle he occupied.

I have lost a firm, true, and respected friend in the passing of John Taber.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable John Taber, a distinguished former Member of the Congress, passed away while Congress stood in adjournment. It is my purpose today to pay a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of John Taber whose courage and adherence to principle stand unsurpassed in the Congress.

When I first came to Congress—the 80th Congress—John Taber was the chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations. I admired him then and later served with Congressman Taber as a member of this committee. My respect and admiration for Congressman Taber continued to grow. We disagreed at times but in disagreement I never failed to respect my colleague.

He stood forthrightly for what he believed—and he believed in the positions he took. Congressman Taber stood for fiscal responsibility and he espoused what he consider to be sound budgetary principles.

He was a colleague for whom all of us who served with him had the highest regard. His integrity was of the highest degree and his devotion to his district, to his State, and to the Nation was absolute.

John Taber was a dedicated American, a patriot, a servant of the people, a friend, and a devoted believer in this great institution, the Congress.

He served long and he served well, and was a stalwart citizen.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the late John Taber was a most valuable Member of this body. He served with great distinction for nearly 40 years. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, once as chairman, he became known as the watchdog of the Treasury. In that capacity he was instrumental in saving American taxpayers untold billions of dollars. It is doubtful if any one Member has ever done more in that respect.

John Taber was indeed a great American. He was devoted to the cause of good government, of sensible restraint in the function of the Central Government, and of those fundamentals which make the competitive free enterprise succeed. During his long period of distinguished service Mr. Taber did more than his share in the preservation of our institutions. We need more men of his dedication if our Republic is to be preserved.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD, following the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the life and achievements of the late John Taber.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE HERBERT COVINGTON BONNER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, we pause to pay tribute to our beloved colleague, HERBERT BONNER, who has passed from the shores of sound to the realm of silence. He has answered his last roll-call.

By his intelligent devotion to duty, his great fidelity to truth, and by the honest and courageous manner in which he discharged all of the vital functions of high office, he endeared himself to his colleagues in Congress and to his countrymen. Modesty and simplicity marked his life; truth was his master; and his unblemished character was the tower of

his strength. HERBERT BONNER was a dedicated public servant and was held in high esteem by the Members of Congress with whom he served so long and so well and by all the Presidents of our Nation with whom he served. He was near and dear to the people of the district which he so well and ably represented, and all the people of our State and of our Nation owe him a great debt of gratitude. He made many great and grand contributions to the welfare and happiness of the people of his district, State, and Nation. As chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries he had jurisdiction over our merchant ships which sail the bosoms of the seven seas and visit all the ports of the world in the prosecution of peaceful and profitable commerce. The Coast Guard which has saved the lives of thousands of people is under the jurisdiction of his great committee. The Coast Guard never had a better friend, nor have merchant seamen ever had a greater champion than HERBERT BONNER. He was worthy of the faith and confidence of the thousands of friends who trusted him.

JUST BE GLAD

(By James Whitcomb Riley)

O heart of mine, we shouldn't worry so!
What we've missed of calm we couldn't have,
you know!

What we've met of stormy pain,
And of sorrow's driving rain,
We can better meet again, if it blow!
We've erred in that dark hour we've known,
When our tears fell with the shower, all
alone!

Were not shine and shower blent
As the gracious Master meant?
Let us temper our content with His own.

For, we know, not every morrow can be
sad;

So, forgetting all the sorrow we have had,
Let us fold away our fears,
And put by our foolish tears,
And through all the coming years just be
glad.

Let us be glad that we knew and loved HERBERT BONNER, and let us today pay tribute to the nobility of his soul. We cannot beautify his character, nor can we exalt his life. We can at this moment only commune with the spirit of our devoted friend.

Mr. Speaker, I insert as a part of my remarks appropriate editorials which appeared in the November 8 edition of the Daily News, and which were written by those who knew and understood and appreciated the true worth of HERBERT COVINGTON BONNER:

[From the Daily News, Nov. 8, 1965]

HERBERT C. BONNER, A GREAT AMERICAN
HERBERT COVINGTON BONNER, truly a great American, has answered his last roll-call.

Here was a man who for most of his adult life had been in the public, serving fully and capably his fellow man, knowing full well that when one serves well his fellow man, he has served his God better.

Here was a man who never stopped to ask "what is politically wise?" Rather he asked only "what is humanly right?"

Here was a man who lived with his political future in his hands, but with his Nation, his State, and his beloved First Congressional District in his heart.

Here was a man who chose all his life to light a candle rather than to curse the dark-

ness. Along the way he lit many candles and in this hour of sadness the lights of love, faith, honor, truth, self-respect, and tremendous dedication glow more brightly, as the man lies in stillness, than they ever did in life.

In his days here we all knew he was a wonderful person. In death we realize now how much greatness we have lost. His strength lay in his courage, his courage in his faith, and his faith stood every test and was never found wanting.

Here was a man who spent his happiest hours here with his own "homefolks," as he so proudly and so often said. No heart was bigger; no soul more generous. His entire life was lived with genuine kindness and love for all and with bitterness and malice toward none.

Here was a man set apart in his generation, a man beloved by so many because he loved so many, a man who has so many monuments which he built and which shall stand as long as one of us remains who knew him and loved him.

HERBERT BONNER, for us, cannot die. Like a ship sailing out of harbor, we lose sight of the physical being, but what he did for so many and what he meant to so many are matters which death cannot take away nor time dim. The candles he lit in his life have served not only to chase away the darkness, but in greater and more glowing terms, they have kindled the fires of hope, freedom, and progress for so many whose steps otherwise might have faltered as they groped along life's pathway. From his life, we the living, can find new faith, and from his works, we the humble, can find new inspiration.

HERBERT BONNER finished his journey on Sunday. What a beautiful thought to feel that he deserved to go away on the day of rest.

Those he loved and those by whom he was beloved are one today in sadness, while at the same time we can look upon his life proudly and say "there was a man." He does not die; he lives forever in the hearts of those he served; he was a joy to himself and an inspiration to those about him.

Yes, he was a great American because he was first a great human being.

[From the Daily News, Nov. 8, 1965]

MILLIGAN STEW

(By Dave Milligan)

There was not a vindictive bone in his body.

When we were on opposite sides of a bombing range squabble, he treated me with such friendship, cordiality and warmth that there were times I didn't know which side I was on * * *.

That's when I found out why people voted for HERBERT BONNER, because knowing him personally, it was impossible to vote against him.

I was chatting with Mr. R. S. Spencer, Sr., of Englehard the other day and I found out something else about him. Years ago, shortly after the turn of the century, Mr. BONNER was a tobacco and snuff salesman.

This is what Mr. Spencer said: "HERBERT use to sell me snuff and tobacco when I opened my store 60 years ago, I was only a boy, and HERBERT was too."

"He would come down from Washington on a horse and buggy, and as you can guess we didn't have much in the way of roads back then, but, that's the only way he could get there, so that's the way he came."

That's 75 miles by horse and buggy.

And he wasn't sure at all of making a sale.

Edmund Harding said he traveled about five counties on horse and buggy. So, if somebody tells you they don't make them like HERBERT BONNER anymore, he's probably right.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] be permitted to extend their remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, during the 5 years I have served as a Member of this body, I have seen on many occasions the flag over the Capitol flying at half mast. I recall when it was so lowered upon the death of President John F. Kennedy. I remember when the body of Gen. Douglas MacArthur lay in state in the rotunda. I have recollections of the death of such congressional giants as the late Sam Rayburn and Clarence Cannon, but none of them came quite so close to home as the recent death of my respected colleague, HERBERT BONNER.

Having served as a Member of Congress for 25 years and for some 15 years before that as secretary to Congressman Lindsay Warren, of North Carolina, who later became Comptroller General of the United States, HERBERT had been on the Washington scene far longer than the great majority of his colleagues. I never tired of hearing his accounts of Washington in general and the Hill in particular during the early twenties when life was simpler, problems less complex, but no less pressing or important.

But unlike many men of his years, he never lived in the past or failed to recognize the changes wrought by time. He kept constantly abreast of current problems—both those national in scope and nature and those of particular or peculiar interest to the people in his own congressional district.

No Congressman ever kept more attuned to the thinking and the wishes of his constituents, or worked any harder or more effectively to promote their interests and well-being.

I learned a great deal from HERBERT BONNER. Some of it came through verbal advice, but a considerable portion from observation of a skilled politician at work.

He will be sorely missed: by his colleagues here in the Congress, by governmental leaders and officials at all levels of government, but most of all by the thousands of common people who were his constituents and whose cause he ardently championed.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the State of North Carolina, the Congress, and our country have suffered a great loss through the passing of HERBERT COVINGTON BONNER on the morning of November 7, 1965.

I want to join our colleagues in paying tribute to our departed friend and express my deep sorrow that he has been taken from us. I was proud to number him among my closest and most cherished friends and will miss his easy and friendly good humor and his wise counsel.

Congressman BONNER was born in Washington, Beaufort County, N.C., on May 16, 1891. He came to Washington in 1940 as secretary to Congressman Lind-

say C. Warren, a position he held for 16 years. Upon Mr. Warren's retirement from Congress and his subsequent appointment as Comptroller General of the United States by the late President Roosevelt, HERBERT BONNER announced his candidacy for Congress and was overwhelmingly elected on November 5, 1940, to the 76th Congress to fill the unexpired term of Congressman Warren. On the same day he was elected to the 77th Congress and was thereafter elected to each succeeding Congress up to and including the 89th.

No words of mine could add anything to the fine record Mr. BONNER has made as chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The written record is an appropriate and eloquent eulogy to him and is replete with proof of his legislative contributions in all areas coming within the jurisdiction of his committee. Nor were his contributions confined to the work of his committee. He kept abreast of all of the more important issues coming before the Congress from time to time and has left a lasting imprint upon the legislative history of our country.

During the 9 years I had the honor and pleasure of being associated with him, I came to love, admire, and respect HERBERT BONNER for his high Christian character, his ability as a legislator, and his unflinching loyalty to duty and friends. His manner of life, his achievements, and his faithful service to his country will long serve as an inspiration to others. I extend to his lovely wife, Eva, and all of his family, my very deep sympathy. May the days ahead lighten the burden of sorrow occasioned by their sad loss.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of HERBERT C. BONNER the House has lost a genuinely able and dedicated Member, and I have lost a warm friend. It has been my good fortune to know HERB BONNER for almost 30 years. When he was elected to the House in 1940, to succeed Lindsay Warren, we were already acquainted with each other through his service as the invaluable secretary to Representative Warren. That acquaintanceship soon ripened to real friendship, and it was my privilege to serve with him on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries immediately after the enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Upon becoming a Member of this House, he brought with him an experience that few Members have had as a result of his 16 years, beginning in the 69th Congress in the office of Representative Warren. As a member and chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, HERB BONNER has been the author and prime mover of some of the most important legislation enacted by the Congress in the past 20 years. His knowledge of shipping laws and problems was phenomenal. His ef-

forts to strengthen the U.S. Coast Guard established him as one of the best friends of that great branch of the Armed Forces.

HERB BONNER was, first of all, a dedicated American. What was best for our country was his first concern and dominated all his actions. During World War I, he served overseas as a noncommissioned officer in the armed infantry with the 81st Division.

Through his many activities in his congressional district in North Carolina, HERB BONNER earned for himself the affection and regard of his constituents and proved himself to be a real humanitarian. We need men like HERB BONNER in the Congress and in every aspect of American life. We are all going to miss him. To his beloved widow and family, I extend my sincere condolences. I know that my colleagues share their grief.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to our colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of the late HERBERT C. BONNER on November 7, 1965, the people of North Carolina and the Nation lost an outstanding Representative in the Congress. It is with a deep sense of sadness and personal loss that I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to this great American, who has laid aside the burdens of this life for a richer reward.

I was shocked and saddened when the news reached me that HERBERT BONNER had passed away. He had been in Congress for many years when I took my seat as a Member of the 85th Congress on January 3, 1957.

Prior to coming to Congress I had met HERBERT BONNER, and I was familiar with his great record of service to the people of his district, State, and Nation. During the years that I was privileged to serve with him in the House of Representatives I grew to love and admire the many fine qualities exemplified in his sterling character and in his devotion to his work in behalf of his district, State, and Nation. I grew to respect his wise judgment and his views on matters affecting the national interest.

HERBERT BONNER had a rich background of public service. By experience and training he was superbly fitted to be an outstanding Congressman. Prior to taking his seat in the 77th Congress he had served as secretary to another great North Carolinian, former Congressman Lindsay Warren.

He measured up in every respect to the demanding duties and responsibilities of his high office. Yet in his approach to his work and in his contact with his fellow man HERBERT BONNER displayed a deep and abiding understanding and appreciation of human nature. This characteristic endeared him to all who had the privilege to know him and to work with him.

HERBERT BONNER was a patriot, a Christian gentleman, and a statesman. He was proud of the fact that he had served his country as a sergeant in World War I and had fought overseas with the 81st Division, U.S. Army. He was a

strong and persistent supporter of national defense. As chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee he had an outstanding record of service.

His State and Nation will miss him in the trying days that lie ahead. All of us, however, can take pride in his many accomplishments. We can take renewed strength in the principles for which he labored.

A great oak has crashed to the earth and against the sky there is a blank space. To the members of HERBERT BONNER's family Mrs. Whitener and I extend our deepest sympathy and sincere condolences on the great loss which they have sustained.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished friends from North Carolina in their tribute to our late, beloved colleague HERBERT BONNER. Representative BONNER was a pillar of strength in this House for many years. Chairman of the great Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, he was a master in his legislative field. He was devoted to the cause of the American Merchant Marine. As much as any Member who ever served in the House, he understood its importance to our safety and our security. The last speech he made was a plea on behalf of the American Merchant Marine.

Congressman BONNER served with distinction. He served with rare dignity. He served with great credit to his district, his State, and his Nation. He was a constructive Member of the House. He was a conscientious Member, a studious Member. At every moment of the day he was a gentleman—kind, courteous, and considerate.

On more than one occasion I have been with HERBERT BONNER in his district. It was a joy to observe the esteem and affection in which he was held by the people he represented. They loved him. They trusted him. They looked to him for leadership in the great issues which confront our Nation. As for me, I shall miss him as long as I live. He was one of the best friends I had in this House. His death has left a great void not only in the legislative operations of this Chamber, but in the heart of every one of us.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his family, to all his host of friends and his loved ones.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY].

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor, though a painful one, to join my colleagues in paying tribute to a friend and former associate—HERBERT C. BONNER.

Even as we meet now to pay our respects, it seems strange to me that he is not here among us—to share in the work and deliberations of this great body. For, he served here not only long—for a quarter of a century—but he served here with distinction.

With his death, the First Congressional District of North Carolina lost an

able champion, the State of North Carolina lost a distinguished representative, the Nation lost a noble statesman, and the world's waterways lost a fearless pilot.

We shall all miss his wise counsel and diligent work in behalf of his district, his State, and his Nation. But those who were privileged, as I was, to know him personally will miss even more the warmth and sincerity of his friendship. There will always be a void which can only be filled by the memory of a man who was small in physical stature but big in heart and accomplishments.

I was proud to call HERBERT BONNER friend. I valued that friendship as I shall his memory. I extend my heartfelt sympathies to his family and many friends.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ].

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago I had the sad duty and, yet, the signal honor, to be a member of the official congressional delegation to go to Washington, N.C., to attend the last rites for our beloved friend and colleague, HERBERT C. BONNER, who left us in the early hours of Sunday, the 7th of November.

I had the privilege of serving in Congress with HERB BONNER ever since 1947 when I first came to Congress. We served on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, an assignment meaningful and dear to both of us, since 1949.

He was my friend.

For almost 11 years now, since HERBERT C. BONNER became chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee, we have stood close together on the majority side of the committee. It was always a pleasure and a privilege to counsel with him. His views on committee matters were always fair and impartial. Though he had short patience with those who tried to dissemble, he was always patient with those who appeared before us in sincerity.

HERB BONNER was a statesman. He was a creator in legislative matters. He not only gave a ready ear to those who approached him with proposals in accord with the constitutional right of petition, but he often vigorously took the initiative to advance worthy causes or explore fields which had otherwise been neglected or pursued too parochially.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, he has been justly acclaimed for the leadership he asserted in the many fields under our committee's jurisdiction: safety of life at sea following the *Andrea Doria-Stockholm* collision, the Isthmian Canal studies, the transpacific and transatlantic superliners, the unique and highly successful Boating Safety Act, the maritime labor management studies of 1955 and 1962, the nuclear ship *Savannah* legislation, the atomic icebreaker legislation, his recognition of the significance of and action in the vital field of oceanography, the reorganization of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, significant efforts in behalf of our ailing domestic shipping in-

dustry, the legislation to require authorization of major programs of acquisition, construction, and improvement in the U.S. Coast Guard, and many other things.

He was a broad and intense man who gave wholly of himself to the public service to which he was devoted.

Perhaps the most moving testimonial of all to the greatness of HERBERT BONNER was the splendid service rendered to him at his funeral in his hometown of Washington, N.C. The reverence and human respect in which he was held was everywhere evident, from the crowds of neighbors who filled the beautiful St. Peter's Episcopal Church to the outpouring of affection shown by the hundreds of schoolchildren who reverently lined the way to his last resting place.

We who knew him, are happy that our ways ran together for a while.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON].

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, the State of North Carolina, the Congress, and this Nation of ours have lost a very distinguished and dedicated public servant. Those of us who are on the floor today have lost a very personable, winsome, lovable friend.

Before I became a Member of this House on January 3, 1957, it was my privilege, during 1953 and 1954, to visit rather extensively in the great First Congressional District of North Carolina, so ably represented by HERB BONNER. There I found the respect, the esteem, and the affection with which he was held by all the people of his district.

Mr. Speaker, since becoming a Member of this body in January of 1957 I have found that HERB BONNER was held in the highest esteem and respect and affection by the full membership of this House.

I have been privileged during the past 9 years to serve as a member of the committee chaired by HERB BONNER, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

I have never known a more knowledgeable man and I never expect to know a more knowledgeable, interested, or concerned man than HERB BONNER was with respect to our national maritime policy.

He was a man of great tolerance. He was tolerant of everything but intolerance. He was a man with a very keen sense of humor. He was a man with a deep sympathy for the problems and personal sufferings and conditions which existed in our world and with individuals.

I counted him a good friend. I have lost a good friend. My wife Kay and I want to join with his other friends on the floor today to extend to his beloved and attractive wife, Miss Eva, as I have always called her, our sincere sympathy for the loss of a man who will always be remembered for his great service.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy and sad heart that I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the

memory of HERBERT COVINGTON BONNER. Although HERBERT had been in declining health for most of 1965, his death came as a profound shock to Mrs. Jonas and to me.

For a number of years we had lived in the same apartment house with the Bonners. Hardly a day passed that Eva and Annie Elliott did not spend some time together. They corresponded during congressional recesses, frequently borrowed household items from each other, and exchanged gifts. I cannot count the times HERBERT would knock at our door to share with us something special Eva had prepared for supper, and frequently I carried something to their apartment which Annie Elliott had prepared and which we wished to share with them. We often visited back and forth and HERBERT and I often rode down to the Capitol together. Ours was therefore a close, personal friendship which ripened with the years, and through this close and intimate relationship I came to know HERBERT better than would have been possible through mere association in the Congress. It is because of this close friendship that we felt such a sense of personal loss in his passing.

When I sat in the quiet church in little Washington attending the funeral services for my departed friend, the words of John Donne, written about 350 years ago, expressed my feelings on that sad occasion:

Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind; and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee (me).

And yet perhaps Angelo Patri best described the feeling I had when my friend died:

In one sense there is no death. The life of a soul lasts beyond his departure. You will always feel that life touching yours, that voice speaking to you, that spirit looking out to other eyes, talking to you in the familiar things he touched, worked with, loved as familiar friends. He lives on in your life and in the lives of others who knew him.

So on this sad occasion I speak not of this man's distinguished public career; that subject will be dealt with by others who were more closely associated with him in his congressional work. I speak not of the leadership he displayed as chairman of the great Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. That subject will be discussed by others who worked with him from day to day in the committee room. I speak not of the great loss suffered in his death by his district, State and Nation; others will devote their attention to that subject.

I speak of the deep sense of personal loss my wife and I feel over the going away of a dear friend who will be sorely missed as the days and years go passing by.

To his grieving Eva, who was HERBERT's constant companion through the years, Annie Elliott and I send our profound sympathy. She has lost a gentle, kind, considerate, and devoted husband. We grieve with her because we have lost a tried and true friend.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much having the opportunity to participate in this eulogy to our friend from North Carolina, Mr. BONNER. When I first came to the House in 1947, it was my privilege to serve on the committee now known as the Committee on Government Operations of which Mr. BONNER was a member. He became one of my first friends and I am happy to say also became one of my best friends during the intervening years.

My first experience in traveling with the committee came in 1949 when a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations made a trip to Europe to observe the operation of the Marshall Plan. It was on this occasion that I had a real opportunity to observe the fine wisdom, tact, diplomacy, and understanding of HERBERT BONNER. Indeed, he steered our committee through very many troublesome experiences because Europe at that time was still in the throes of the aftermath of World War II and we were in a position of trying to determine what we could and should do to alleviate the situation.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have lost a fine friend and North Carolina has lost a fine Congressman. I would say that he was truly more than a Representative from the State of North Carolina, he was a representative of the people of the United States. It was my great privilege just to have known HERBERT BONNER and to have profited by his fine character. Mrs. Harvey and I join in extending to his widow, Eva, our sincerest and deepest sympathy in this hour of her grief.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my distinguished colleagues in paying respect to our late and esteemed colleague, the Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER. The people of North Carolina and the Nation realize that in HERBERT BONNER they had a great and dedicated representative in the U.S. Congress.

Congressman BONNER was a man of the people. He served as a sergeant in World War I, and throughout life he was a soldier in the ranks. He remained humble and close to the people whom he served. He kept an open mind and a responsive heart to the needs of the people. Even though he walked with kings, he kept the common touch. He loved the Democratic Party and his loyalty to that party even during times of storm and stress was firm and consistent.

Congressman BONNER's fairness and fine qualities of character made him a friend of Congressmen of both political parties. He established a standard of excellence in public service which all of us might well try to emulate. He added dignity, respect, and integrity to politics.

Mrs. Taylor and I also lived in the same apartment house with Herbert and Eva Bonner. We have never had better neighbors. When they would go home on weekends they would frequently bring us fresh fish from the North Carolina coast. Mr. BONNER did not miss an opportunity to do a favor for a friend and

in turn he was held in high esteem and affection by the Members of Congress, by the people of his congressional district, and by his friends throughout the world.

As a Member of Congress for 25 years, Mr. BONNER never lost faith in the principles of duty and devotion to the causes of freedom. We can keep faith with him now by continuing to fight for fair play, and justice, and freedom, and Americanism—as he would have done. Mr. BONNER was a friend to Mrs. Taylor and me, and we shall miss him.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DOWNING].

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, it was my sad duty also to be present at the funeral of our beloved friend, HERBERT C. BONNER, in the beautiful little town of Washington, in his beloved State of North Carolina. At that funeral there were literally thousands of people, sad people, from all walks of life, who had come to pay a final tribute to a beloved friend. It was an impressive display of devotion and love for their fellow man. It was my great privilege to have known Mr. BONNER. It was another great privilege to have worked with him. I loved him as a man, I respected him as a colleague and I shall cherish his memory forever.

Mr. Speaker, the domestic maritime industries have lost a close friend and a strong advocate.

For more than 10 years, HERBERT C. BONNER dedicated himself to the creation of legislation that would vitalize our Nation's maritime fleet and domestic fisheries. His chairmanship of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee spanned difficult years for the United States sea-based industries. But HERBERT BONNER's patient legislative leadership has enabled our domestic maritime and fisheries interests to make progress—even in the face of harsh competition on the seas and hard economic ceilings on development.

My North Carolina neighbor—my First Virginia District and his First North Carolina District adjoin—have been good neighbors and good friends for the nearly 7 years that we worked together on maritime and fisheries legislation. He helped me as a patient and thoughtful teacher and as an understanding House colleague. His passing has caused me real sorrow and I will remember the man all my life—not only for the warm friendship we knew but also for his contributions to our maritime industries.

HERBERT BONNER's record in this body is a record of great dimension—encompassing safety of life at sea, the nuclear ship *Savannah*, the atomic icebreaker, oceanographic advancements, and fisheries research. His mark is on every major piece of maritime legislation to emanate from the Capitol. We are all able to take a measure of pride in his dedication to meaningful legislation for the industries he served. HERBERT BONNER served us well, Mr. Speaker, and he served his constituents well. He will be sorely missed.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our departed colleague, the beloved HERBERT BONNER, and to extend my deepest sympathy and condolence to his widow and his family.

As a Representative of a State completely surrounded by water, I have had the occasion to seek the counsel and assistance of HERB on many occasions about Merchant Marine and Fisheries matters, he being the chairman of that great committee.

Mr. Speaker, HERB BONNER always lent a willing, and, what is more important, a cheerful and attentive ear and shared of his wisdom accumulated over the years.

Mr. Speaker, his constituents, his State, and the Nation, have lost a devoted and dedicated public servant. We will long reap the benefits of his toil. I, for one, can honestly state that my life has been enriched for having known HERB BONNER. I shall miss him as a friend and counselor.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in this expression of respect for the memory of our late and great friend, HERBERT BONNER.

When I came to this body just a few short years ago, Mr. BONNER was known to me as an able legislator and a key figure in the House of Representatives. I, and I believe all North Carolinians respected him as a statesman who in his years of leadership had been an eloquent champion of causes for his State and his Nation. In a personal way this man's ability, integrity, and wide-ranging knowledge was demonstrated to me in the early days of my first year of service here in the House of Representatives. And it was demonstrated as he extended the hand of friendship and help across the political aisle. He was one who was willing to give of his advice and counsel from his vast store of information and eminent good sense.

Mr. Speaker, HERBERT's passing was a great loss to the State of North Carolina, and it was a loss to America. I was profoundly moved at his funeral services in December because of the fact that literally thousands of people in his hometown came out to pay respect to their friend and fellow-townsmen, HERBERT BONNER. In this way they were returning the unswerving devotion that had been so markedly obvious in HERBERT BONNER's years of service to the people in his district.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Broyhill joins me in extending deepest sympathy to Mrs. Bonner. We shall miss HERBERT in the years ahead. We shall miss his mellow good humor, his friendship, and his inspiring example as a dedicated servant of his State and the American people.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I could not permit these tributes to the late HERBERT BONNER to close without adding a few words.

Mr. Speaker, I was not a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and I do not come from the area represented by the late great HERB BONNER. However, I would like to relate to the Members of the House a pleasant experience which I had with this fine gentleman. A few years ago my family wanted to make a visit to the State of North Carolina. I spoke to Mr. BONNER about our anticipated trip. Instead of sending over some tourist brochures—he went out of his way to propose an itinerary through his district. He mentioned the important things to see. Also, he offered to make reservations. This demonstrated to me his spirit of unselfishness and his desire to be of service to any of his colleagues.

Then, Mr. Speaker, when we arrived in the district which he represented I learned that everyone in that district was proud of their Congressman. When I mentioned that I was a fellow Member of the House of Representatives, they would say, "Do you know our Congressman?" I said, "Yes; not as well as I would prefer, but in the few years that I have had the privilege to know him, it has been a great thrill to be an associate of a man like HERB BONNER."

Mr. Speaker, I feel that a few words should be said about his work on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. This is a way of saying some of the things that he did for his country.

Mr. Speaker, HERB BONNER was not simply a proponent of a strong merchant fleet, or just another advocate. He was its champion. I am sure that his warning, again and again, will stand us in good stead. We are beginning now to wake up to the fact that not as much attention has been given to our merchant fleet as should have been given in the past. I know that the new chairman of the committee will follow in the footsteps of the late HERBERT BONNER to see that measures are taken to arrest the declining strength of our fleet and instead build up our merchant marine which represents such a great asset not only to our commerce but as an arm of our national defense.

Mr. Speaker, we have all lost a good friend. I know that as the years go by he will always be esteemed in the memory of his fellow Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

I now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished dean of the North Carolina delegation for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, on the first day of my service in this body I met a quiet, soft-spoken, and sweet-tempered gentleman who performed an act of gracious neighborly kindness to a freshman Member of the House of Representatives.

For nearly 12 years after that I had the privilege of officing in close proximity to this fine American, HERB BONNER.

North Carolina has sent many outstanding men to the Congress, but I doubt that any Representative of that great State has ever been held in higher esteem or greater affection by his colleagues, than our dear friend, HERB BONNER.

A quiet, modest, and kindly man, HERB BONNER was both persuasive and powerful in his participation in debate. He handled the legislation of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, over which he presided as chairman, with outstanding ability and success.

A gentleman in the finest and broadest sense of the word, HERB BONNER contributed greatly to the constructive work of the House of Representatives, and won new friends with every day of his service.

He will be missed by a host of friends in this body, and every one who knew him well will treasure the memory of his friendship.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STUBBLEFIELD].

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of great personal loss that I join my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to the memory of the late Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER. In a broader sense, however, his untimely passing is a loss to every citizen of this great Nation. I was privileged to serve on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee under his capable chairmanship. I shall remember him as a highly dedicated legislator who served the public interest with all the strength and capacity at his command.

It goes without saying that HERBERT BONNER was a man of integrity and unquestionable character. He loved his native North Carolina and was continually alert to opportunities to be of service to the people of his district and State. His devotion to and love of country was unexcelled, as evidenced by his zealous efforts to uphold and defend those principles which have made this country great. HERB BONNER will be missed, not only by his devoted family and Members of this House, but also by countless people throughout the Nation who came to know and respect him.

I extend sincere sympathy to Mrs. Bonner and to the other family members.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the country have lost a great man and a distinguished legislator. I have lost a dear friend. In HERBERT C. BONNER, of North Carolina, were combined the qualities that endear a man to friends, colleagues, constituents, and even to casual acquaintances. His life was a record of achievement worthy not only of praise, but of emulation as well.

He was born in Washington, N.C., on May 16, 1891, and completed his education in Warrenton, N.C. During World War I, he served as a sergeant in the AEF. In 1924, he became an aid of Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, then a member of the State assembly, but soon to be elected to the U.S. House of Representatives.

HERBERT BONNER accompanied Mr. Warren to Washington, D.C., where he was employed by Mr. Warren as a congressional assistant.

When Mr. Warren was appointed Comptroller General of the United States in 1940, HERBERT C. BONNER, his faithful and dedicated assistant through the years, ran successfully to fill the vacancy. He was continuously reelected thereafter, and served in the halls of the House of Representatives for a quarter of a century.

As a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House of Representatives from the time of his first election to this body in 1940, and as committee chairman from 1955, he was impartial in his criticism of the role of management, labor, and the Federal Government in maritime affairs. He believed that maritime labor demanded excessive wages, that management refused to cross the frontiers of automation, and that the Government was unwilling to broaden Federal aid. His efforts through the years were strenuous indeed as he sought to impose some order on what he once called "the Alice in Wonderland world" of the maritime industry.

After hearings by his committee, construction was authorized for the nuclear-powered commercial ship, the freighter *Savannah*. When the \$50 million vessel was finished in 1962, and the crew specially trained, the vessel was struck, and demands were made for better accommodations, more safety precautions, and increased benefits. This incident and others convinced Representative BONNER that Federal arbitration might be necessary in the maritime industry.

He was thus an ardent proponent of modernizing the U.S. merchant fleet. He once wrote:

The inability of domestic shipping to revive or even survive with traditional means of cargo handling and traditional ships is painfully evident.

He called upon his congressional colleagues to find ways to get "new ideas and new life into water transportation." He bent his every effort to this purpose.

He became convinced that an international agency to oversee safety standards on all ships was necessary after the collision of the vessels *Stockholm* and *Andrea Doria* in 1956. His committee held an investigation of that disaster which had occurred outside American territorial waters, off Nantucket Light, and had claimed 50 lives.

HERBERT C. BONNER's interest in maritime affairs came naturally to him. His district spanned Pamlico Sound and the Outer Banks of North Carolina. In the words of a friend, "He loved the water and was a superb fisherman." He even worked with pleasure-boating associations to promote water safety among small boat owners.

He initiated a congressional study of the present efficiency of the Panama Canal as a modern interocean waterway. A board of consultants, appointed at his suggestion, is studying the problems of modernizing the canal, and considering the feasibility of constructing alternate routes.

During his 25 years as a Member of Congress, HERBERT C. BONNER served on six committees. He was a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities from 1945 to 1947. As chairman of a Subcommittee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, he supervised an investigation of postwar profiteers who had bought U.S. surplus materials and then resold them to the Government at inflated prices. After this inquiry had been completed, Representative BONNER led a group of Members of the House on a 41-day worldwide examination of both efficiency and waste at American military establishments abroad.

Among his recorded votes were those which favored lend-lease and the Marshall plan. He was awarded the American Legion's Distinguished Service Medal for his efforts to strengthen the merchant marine. He was often called the "Father of the *Savannah*."

Last summer, when he returned to the House of Representatives after a painful operation and a long convalescence, he was greeted by applause on the floor of the House by his fellow Members. It was well that this accolade was given to him then, for he was lost to us on November 7, 1965.

He was soft spoken but incredibly hard working. His manner was retiring, but his popularity among the Members of this House was overwhelming. On this occasion, I join with all of his friends here, throughout the country, and back in North Carolina, in mourning his passing.

Mrs. McCormack and I extend to Mrs. Bonner our deep sympathy in her very great loss and sorrow.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the American merchant marine, beset by difficult problems today, owes its present strength and growth to our colleague, HERBERT BONNER, more than to any other man in our country. By his passing last fall, our merchant marine has lost its stoutest defender, its greatest exponent, its strongest promoter.

Stricken though he was with a fatal malady, HERBERT BONNER continued to work in the best interests of our country until the end. He was planning to direct the conduct of thorough hearings into the present status of the merchant marine, the problems which it faces, with a view toward providing remedial, constructive legislation which would bolster our merchant fleet and give to it renewed vigor and greater world influence. HERBERT BONNER, the great patriot that he was, also was working to find ways and means to furnish more merchant ships for carrying desperately needed food, medicines, and other cargo to our troops in South Vietnam and to the stricken people of that war-torn country.

Devotion to his country and to his people in his beloved North Carolina, and a love of this House, were the guiding actions of his life. HERBERT BONNER not only was a dedicated public servant, but also he was a great man—a wonderful human being who was beloved by all.

HERBERT BONNER devoted his entire life to this House—he was a congressional secretary for 16 years to the late

Congressman Lindsay C. Warren, of the First District of North Carolina. When his boss was appointed Comptroller General of the United States by President Roosevelt in 1940, HERBERT BONNER elected to run to succeed Congressman Warren. And elected he was in November 1940 to the 77th Congress—the same Congress in which I first entered this House.

From his first term until his last breath, HERBERT BONNER was a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and for the last 10 years of his public service, he was chairman of that great committee. Probably the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has never had a more perceptive, hard-working chairman since it was established. HERBERT BONNER provided the kind of leadership and direction which only a man of foresight and dedication can give, and HERBERT BONNER gave his devotion in large measure.

There is no doubt that he did more to refurbish and strengthen the American merchant marine than has any other man in the history of our country. Among the many significant pieces of legislation in other fields which he promoted and steered to passage were the Small Boat Act of 1958, which gave a classification system to thousands more of our smaller boats and thus enhanced boating safety throughout the Nation; and the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, which provided for the establishment of an independent, separate agency for commercial fisheries, and also brought vastly expanded protection for our Nation's wildlife.

What I have cited here are but a small rendering of the contributions made to his State and our Nation by HERBERT BONNER. I loved him as a brother; I salute him as a fellow colleague of this House which we all love so well; and I am happy and proud to have known him, to have shared in his friendship and his wisdom. May God rest his soul always.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the life and memory of the late Honorable HERBERT BONNER, the able former chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. It was my privilege to serve with Mr. BONNER during the whole of his 25 years as a Member of the House. Indeed, he and I became friends during the time he was an aid to the late Lindsay Warren of the great State of North Carolina, whom he succeeded.

I could not improve upon the fine sentiments expressed here but I can do no less than endorse them. It was a pleasure and an honor to serve in this great representative body with a man of the stature of HERBERT BONNER. The people of North Carolina and of the Nation owe him a debt of gratitude for his contributions to the national welfare.

May the Lord bless his memory.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the tragic passing of our respected and admired colleague, HERB BONNER, was a sad event for the Nation and for the district which he represented for so many years in such a distinguished way, as well as for all of

his host of friends and admirers, both here and throughout the country.

HERBERT BONNER was elected to the Congress shortly after I became a Member, and we have served together throughout the years as close friends. His contributions as chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which has handled such a volume of legislation of vital interest to this Nation over a period of many years, will serve as a monument to his dedication, ability, and intense devotion to duty.

Those of us who have observed HERB BONNER over the years in the House of Representatives are familiar with the extent to which he always informed himself in detail on the legislation which he handled on the floor of the House and which he guided to successful passage. We all know the meticulous manner and the precision with which he responded to questions and the comprehensiveness of his responses on the whole range of matters falling within the scope of his committee jurisdiction. He was assiduous in protecting and promoting the interests of his district, his State, and the Nation. His diligence in assisting his constituents and in looking out for their interests was a matter of common knowledge in the House.

I extend to his surviving family deepest sympathy and condolences but with a reminder that his career of public service will forever stand as a monument to his character and the great work which he has accomplished.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, HERBERT BONNER was a Member of 14 consecutive Congresses, and at the time of his passing only 14 Members of the House, including Speaker McCORMACK, former Speaker MARTIN and Chairman CELLER, the dean, had enjoyed a longer tenure of service. When the 89th Congress convened, six of its Members had come in with the 76th Congress and had been reelected at each succeeding election. Now the number has been reduced to four by the deaths during the past year of Clarence Brown and HERBERT BONNER. I shall always remember HERBERT BONNER as a man of infinite patience and unfailing courtesy. A number of times I consulted with him in his capacity as chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on matters of interest to my constituents living on Lake Michigan and always he was generous with his time and most gracious in his manner. He was held in respect and affection by the members of the Illinois delegation and our grief at his passing is real and deep. He was a great American in peace and in war, being a combat veteran with the 322th Infantry of the 81st Division in World War I. To his wife and the members of his family I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with a deep sense of loss and sorrow that I learned of the passing of our beloved friend and colleague, HERBERT C. BONNER. For more than a quarter of a century he had served with great distinction in the House of Representatives and during that time he won the friendship, esteem, and admiration of all who came to know him.

As chairman of the important Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries he showed a rare legislative insight and the highest degree of statesmanship. It was my privilege and honor to work with HERB BONNER through the many years we served together in the House of Representatives. He was a great Democrat and a credit to our party. He was one of those unassuming, modest men who worked quietly and succeeded in reaching his goals.

HERB BONNER's legislative achievements were significant and many. His passing leaves a void that will long be felt in this House, and we shall miss his cheerful personality and the outstanding abilities he applied to the legislative work of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the host of his friends and fellow workers in extending our heartfelt condolences and deepest sympathy to the family of our departed friend, HERBERT C. BONNER.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it was a deep sense of sadness when I learned of the passing of the admired and highly respected Congressman HERBERT BONNER. I want to join my colleagues in the House this afternoon in eulogizing this outstanding statesman and gentleman from North Carolina.

I had the privilege and pleasure of knowing HERBERT BONNER when he was a traveling salesman in North and South Carolina and later when he was secretary to Congressman Lindsay Warren, who was later appointed to the position as U.S. Comptroller General. Mr. BONNER was an outstanding Member of this body and also made an excellent record as secretary to Mr. Warren for approximately 10 years before he succeeded Mr. Warren as a Member of the House. I am certain I have never met anyone who had a better sense of humor and possessed all those necessary factors to work with all types of personalities.

Congressman BONNER made an excellent committee chairman and I am certain every member of his committee feels as I do when I state that the State of North Carolina and the entire country have lost one of its greatest statesmen.

Congressman BONNER could come as near sizing up a person and knowing the sincerity behind any proposal made by a Member of Congress than any person I have ever had an opportunity to know since I have been a Member of Congress.

Mrs. Bonner has my deepest sympathy and every person privileged with HERBERT's acquaintance will always miss him.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our dear, beloved friend, and very distinguished colleague, Congressman HERBERT C. BONNER, of North Carolina, is a great loss to the Congress and the Nation and to this great deliberative body.

His long devoted service here constitutes an imperishable record which has been marked by outstanding ability, unexcelled fidelity to principle, and the highest order of patriotism.

He was both articulate and knowledgeable.

His diligence and his work and his attention to duty marked him as an extremely conscientious public servant.

His spirit of dedication commanded the respect, confidence, and admiration of all of us and all those who knew him.

His great district and State have sustained a truly irreparable loss since his concern for his own people knew no bounds, and he served them with an unselfish devotion.

He was, in truth, as a soldier, gallantly serving the Nation, when he was stricken at the very height of his powers, while zealously upholding the cause of God and country.

His family and all his dear ones who are so sorely afflicted by his untimely passing are the ones who will feel his loss most keenly. Their burden of sorrow is, indeed, a very heavy one, and in extending my deepest sympathy to them in this hour of sad bereavement, I hope and pray that the good Lord will bring them reconciliation and the courage and patience to bear their loss with strength and fortitude.

HERB BONNER will long be remembered in this body. His service was so memorable, his friendship so warm, and his ties so enduring. Both his laudable service and the memory of his true friendship will long remain with us, and his outstanding achievements will brilliantly illuminate the annals of this, the greatest deliberative body in the world, for many years to come.

We may well say of him: "Well done, thy good and faithful servant." May the good Lord smile upon him and bring him peace in His eternal home.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it was a privilege for me to have the opportunity to serve on the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee under the chairmanship of our departed colleague, the Honorable HERBERT BONNER.

Through many long and involved hearings, I found him to be able and completely fair in his conduct of the committee. With scores of other Members, I will miss the presence of my friend, HERBERT BONNER, in the House of Representatives.

I extend my sympathy to his widow and to other members of his family.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the absence of Congressman BONNER from our Chamber is sadly felt by us all; and the country mourns his passing as an able and dedicated legislator and American. It was my pleasure for several years to serve on his Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and it was a rich and inspiring service because of his ability, character, and his kindness to all with whom he associated. We have lost a great Congressman and a dear friend and our hearts go out in sympathy to all his bereaved family.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our late beloved chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER, whose death is a grievous loss to all of us.

I have had the honor and the privilege of working with him as a member of the committee which he so ably headed. I

found him to be a man of deep understanding, a devoted public servant, and a capable leader. His guidance and counsel were always most helpful. He was particularly helpful to me in matters pertaining to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy and other Coast Guard installations located in my district in Connecticut.

During the quarter of a century of his service in the House of Representatives, HERBERT BONNER not only left his imprint on Congress and on many legislative acts, but he also left a host of friends and admirers who had the highest regard for him. We shall always remember him as a man of wisdom, patience, courtesy, and able leadership. His death is a deep loss to those of us who had the occasion to work with him more closely.

I extend to his widow and to other members of his family my deepest sympathy in this hour of their great bereavement.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, for more than 10 years it was my good fortune to serve on the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, while HERB BONNER was the chairman. During this time, I learned firsthand that HERB was a man of the highest integrity, dedicated to the welfare of all matters coming under his committee jurisdiction.

For a number of years, my wife and I lived right across the hall from the HERBERT BONNERS in an apartment house. It was during this time that I first learned to know HERB and to realize that, modest and quiet though he was, he had a wide knowledge and keen understanding of the problems confronting the maritime and fishing industries. Especially, I discovered the patient care he always gave to his committee responsibilities.

So it is that my association with him—now, unhappily, terminated—has left warm memories as well as deep respect and admiration.

It was a real honor to serve under HERBERT BONNER, and I shall never cease to cherish this experience.

To his wife, who was so dear to him and always his close companion, my wife and I extend our most profound sympathy. We share her sorrow. The memory of her husband's fine character and wonderful record is something that Mrs. Bonner will retain along with the devotion of her husband's friends, and we hope these blessings will always bring her comfort and satisfaction.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to join in tribute to our esteemed colleague, Hon. HERBERT BONNER, of the State of North Carolina.

Over the past 20 years during which Congressman BONNER served his constituents and his country so well, he earned the respect and admiration of us all.

His strength and quiet wit will long be remembered and will surely be missed by those of us who considered him a valued friend.

Having been brought up spending my summers on the shores of Long Island, where the sport of fishing was enjoyed by amateurs as well as professional sportsmen, I shared a common interest with Congressman BONNER. It was al-

ways a great pleasure for me to listen to his many fishing experiences.

I am sure the Outer Banks of the Carolina Coast will no longer be the same. The fisherman has gone to his eternal home.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened and shocked when I learned that on November 7, 1965, the Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER, of North Carolina, died in Walter Reed Army Hospital here in Washington. I wish to join my many colleagues in sadly saluting the memory of a man who devoted 25 years of his life to serving the people of North Carolina and the United States.

For most of the 25 years HERB BONNER spent in the House of Representatives, and in his service on the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, he fought to strengthen and stabilize this country's maritime industry. He believed as most of us do, that the merchant marine was, and is a vital part of America's strength. For a decade as chairman of that vital committee, he fought for improved safety regulations at sea and technological advancement throughout the industry. In fighting to strengthen the merchant marine, a fight that I wholeheartedly did and do support, HERBERT C. BONNER was serving not only the great State of North Carolina, but all the people of this country. He shall be sorely missed.

To his family, I extend my deepest sympathy and condolence.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of HERBERT BONNER the Nation has lost a wise and able statesman. But, more particularly, the American Merchant Marine has lost a champion and skilled architect. No man labored more or gave more unstintingly of himself on its behalf throughout almost three decades than did HERB BONNER.

The fast, modern greyhounds of the seas, which today carry the American flag to the farflung corners of the globe, stand in living tribute as a monument to the endeavors of this one man. These same ships, constructed as a result of the vision and foresight of HERBERT BONNER, are today bridging the oceans to supply American troops in Vietnam. Seamen and American fighting men throughout the world owe a great debt to this man. Truly, one can say that memorials to his achievements are now in being throughout the world wherever American-flag merchant ships ply their trade.

But to me the death of HERB BONNER means much more. I have lost a warm and personal friend with whom I have labored side-by-side for more than 13 years. He was a close confidant. He was a man whose counsel I held in greatest respect. He was a man whom I grew to love more with each passing year.

Perhaps the English poet laureate, Robert Southey, best expressed my feelings when he said, and I quote:

The loss of a friend is like that of a limb; time may heal the anguish of the wound, but the loss cannot be repaired.

To his devoted and gracious widow, Eva, I can only say that her sadness is shared by HERBERT's legion of friends and

admirers. Perhaps this fact will make her burden just a little easier to bear.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, while Congress was adjourned, one of our most esteemed and dedicated colleagues, Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER, of North Carolina, passed away. I was saddened to learn of his death and to realize that Congressman BONNER would not be with us any longer. We shall miss him—I want to join with my colleagues in paying a brief but sincere tribute to his memory.

HERBERT C. BONNER served in the Congress for a quarter of a century. Congressman BONNER was a great American. He served his country well; he served his beloved State of North Carolina well, and he served his district well and long and faithfully. As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marines, he was known nationally as the father of the nuclear-powered ship *Savannah*, and for other work directed toward modernizing our merchant marine fleet.

I knew HERBERT C. BONNER as a dedicated American, an able colleague, and a man devoted to principle. He had a keen grasp of the responsibilities of public service, and he responded to those responsibilities.

He will be sorely missed in the Congress and most difficult to replace. His legacy of service will live for untold generations as a monument to his dedication.

I extend to Mrs. Bonner and other members of his family my deepest sympathy in their irreplaceable loss.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying homage to the late Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER. It was my privilege to serve but briefly with this courtly gentleman on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which he so ably chaired for more than a decade.

My great regret is the brevity of my association with HERB BONNER. It is my personal loss that I did not know him sooner. He was a man whom I rapidly grew to respect and admire. Dedicated in purpose and undaunted by adversity, Chairman BONNER gave unsparingly of himself to the service of his constituents, the development of a strong American merchant marine, and the preservation of this Nation's natural resources. The product of his tireless efforts stand in tribute and memorial to his skill and dedication.

The late Father Edmund A. Walsh, S.J., of Georgetown University, was a staunch advocate for a strong American merchant marine. Men such as Congressman BONNER must have been in his thoughts when Father Walsh wrote:

A statesman is the rare thinker who keeps his gaze fixed on the next generation. He will have learned wisdom from past errors and schooled himself to distinguish the deep and permanent residue of economic history from the surface tones that speak only of quick gains and enhanced profits. He will be a statesman in the measure that he teaches men to fasten on abiding values and rescues them from the lure of the temporary and the transient.

Such a public leader was the late Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER. His untimely death is a loss not only for his

beloved State of North Carolina, but for the Nation as a whole.

To the widow of our late beloved chairman and to other members of his family, I extend my heartfelt sympathy in this their hour of bereavement. All our hearts are saddened over their loss, but comforted in the knowledge of the privilege of having known and labored with the late Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER. I knew him as a wonderfully generous, considerate, always fair, and effective chairman under whose leadership I was proud to serve.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I join in the eulogies that have been accorded to my late friend and colleague, HERBERT BONNER. Quiet, calm, and sensible, he was a faithful and devoted Member of this body. Always honorable and conscientious, HERBERT commanded universal respect. With his passing I have lost a close personal friend, and the Nation has lost a valuable public servant. To the surviving family I extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished predecessor in the House, the Honorable Carl T. Durham, has sent me a statement to place in the RECORD in the memory of his lifetime colleague and close personal friend, the late Honorable HERBERT COVINGTON BONNER.

It is a pleasure and a privilege to comply with Mr. Durham's request, particularly in view of his intimate association with Mr. BONNER in the House and his personal affection and regard for him. Mr. Durham's statement follows:

I wish to extend to Mrs. Bonner and the people of the First Congressional District of North Carolina my deep and sincere sympathy in the loss they have sustained in HERBERT's passing. For more than 40 years HERBERT and I were close friends, and I served with him in the Congress for more than 20 years. His personal popularity and the high esteem in which he was held extended throughout the House of Representatives and the Senate as well. During the many years in which he served the first district he gave to his constituents a dedicated service. He will now take his place in the history of our State of North Carolina as one of the great and effective men to serve in the U.S. Congress.

But the canvas of his achievements was not restricted to his district and State, for, as chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, he made significant and enduring contributions to our national maritime policy which will long be remembered.

My heartfelt sympathy goes out to Eva and the family in their great bereavement, which is shared by all who knew HERBERT and his sterling worth to his district, State, and Nation.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the life, character, and service of our late beloved colleague, HERBERT C. BONNER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUCINSKI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION CONTINUES TO SPEND MORE MONEY THAN IT TAKES IN

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina.

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, facts revealed in the daily statement of the U.S. Treasury for December 30, 1965, indicate that the administration continues to spend more money than it takes in, continues to borrow money to pay current bills, and that the outflow of gold from this country continues.

Currently the Government is spending money at the rate of \$380 million a day or \$16 million every hour of every day and night.

This year-end statement of the U.S. Treasury shows that from July 1, 1965, through December 30, 1965, the Government spent \$11 billion more than it took in. In the corresponding period last year the excess of spending over receipts was \$9 billion. Therefore, the deficit in the first half of the current fiscal year is \$2 billion more than it was last year.

That same Treasury statement shows that on December 30, 1965, the national debt stood at \$321 billion as contrasted with \$318 billion on December 30, 1964. This debt has climbed from \$290 billion when Eisenhower left office to \$321 billion on December 30, 1965—an increase of \$31 billion during the 5 Kennedy-Johnson years. It now takes about a billion dollars a month to pay the interest on that debt.

The statement also shows that gold on hand at December 30, 1965, stood at \$13.7 billion as contrasted with \$15.3 billion on December 31, 1964. This is a loss of \$1.6 billion in gold during calendar year 1965.

I bring these facts to the attention of the House at the beginning of the new session of Congress because they indicate that the administration is not yet prepared to practice fiscal discipline but is continuing headlong down the spend-thrift road. The continued erosion in the purchasing power of our dollars is one aftermath of this policy, and I would remind my colleagues that those who suffer most from inflation are people in the poverty classification who must live on fixed incomes and who see their dollars buy fewer and fewer groceries.

Soon we will be called upon to decide how we shall finance the increasing costs of the war in Vietnam. There are only several choices: The Government can continue its present policy of borrowing, taxes can be increased, or it can reduce spending on projects that can be deferred until the war is over and we have our financial house in order.

I do not know how you feel about it but my view is that the latter course is the one we should follow.

FAILURE OF THE GEORGIA LEGISLATURE TO SEAT JULIAN BOND

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, it was a poor decision that the Georgia Legislature made this week in voting to prevent Mr. Julian Bond, of Atlanta, from taking the seat to which he was duly elected at the last election. Mr. Bond is one of the spokesmen of that generation of young southern Negroes who have shown their courage and their dedication to the finest values of American life.

However, in encouraging draft card burners, he is wrong. Yet I do not believe it was the act of statesmen for members of the Georgia House to deny him his seat. Expression of opinion cannot properly serve as a bar to the right of public office. His exclusion was unfortunate in coming at a time when Georgia was showing to her sister States in the Deep South the way to adjustments to a new era in racial relations.

I believe in doing so they violated the spirit of the first amendment which guarantees freedom of speech to all citizens. I hope the Georgia Legislature will repent. Georgia's record in recent years has been too good for the State to be stigmatized by this unwise act.

COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to provide for the enactment of a cold war GI bill, similar to those enacted for veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict.

Mr. Speaker, it is very evident that our present selective service law is just what its name implies, selective. Unfortunately, it selects for service in the military those who in too many cases cannot afford to seek higher education.

The Members of this House and of the other body, too, decided in their wisdom some years ago that those who gave time out of their productive years to defend this Nation ought to receive some assistance in order that they could compete on a more even basis with those who stayed behind. This is a very sound approach and I think that before we ring down the final curtain on the 89th Congress, we ought to do as much for our young men in uniform today as we did for those who served in earlier wars.

It is very gratifying to learn that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] who has done such a great job as chairman of the House Committee, agrees with me that something should be done. I would like at this time to publicly commend the gentleman from Texas as one of the best friends the American veteran has ever had. His willingness to aid future veterans as well as those who served earlier is to his eternal credit.

The Korean GI bill and the earlier World War II bill were not giveaways, rather, they were investments which have since enactment repaid the Government many times in the form of increased tax revenue.

As a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I have always supported legislation which will serve to broaden educational opportunity. This bill will serve to do the same for those young men who are now serving this Nation throughout the world.

I strongly urge immediate passage of a cold war GI bill of rights.

H.R. 11894—HORTON BILL TO COMPENSATE VICTIMS OF VIOLENT CRIMES

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of this session, I introduced H.R. 11894—the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act of 1966. This is the first, and perhaps the most crucial of a series of legislative proposals dealing with crime that I plan to introduce this year. It provides for the compensation of citizens who fall victim to the violent and heinous crimes which have become increasingly common in our Nation's cities.

Compensation for personal injury suffered by victims of criminal violence is a problem that we can no longer ignore. Daily, we read of the horrible incidents suffered by hapless victims of criminal violence. Here in the District of Columbia, the seat of government of a great country, it is hardly safe to go abroad after the setting of the evening sun. A similar situation, I believe, exists in many other areas of this country. Incidents of this nature are so numerous, and of such frequency that any attempt at enumeration is pointless. Overall, the Federal Bureau of Investigation reports that during the first 9 months of 1965 the crime index was up 5 percent over the same period for the prior year. Increases were reported in all crime categories, ranging from a 2-percent increase in aggravated assault to 6 percent in forcible rape. Nationally, the violent crimes of murder, forcible rape, aggravated assault, and robbery, as a group showed a substantial increase. According to FBI reports, criminal offenses in my own community of Rochester, N.Y., rose 70 percent in the past 3 years.

In the perpetration of these offenses the victim is in a very real sense a double victim. He is attacked by the assailant, often brutally beaten, stripped of his possessions, and left senseless with his body battered and torn. In many instances the victim is the only support of his family. Society, as well as the victim, suffers from these acts of criminal violence.

It seems that in this country we have proceeded on the theory that if the criminal were prosecuted, crime would be reduced and there would be fewer victims of the criminal. This has not

been the case. Crime continues to increase.

It is the innocent victim of crime who must pay for the medical treatment which he must receive. It is the survivors of a murdered wage earner who must face years of financial hardship and perhaps poverty. The plight of victims of crime, I submit, should be brought more in line with that of disabled employees. A disabled worker may receive substantial compensation for an injury suffered in the course of his employment, even though his negligence may have contributed to the injury; yet, the same worker, if disabled from a criminal attack for which he bore no responsibility whatsoever, has no similar protection.

Our governments spend billions in protecting us from criminals. We sanction the fact that our governments go to great lengths to protect suspected criminals from punishment. But should not our governments owe an obligation to compensate innocent victims of crime, crimes inevitably resulting through the difficulty of providing perfect police protection?

The concept of compensation for victims of crime is not new. Hammurabi, the King of Babylonia, in ancient times, is reputed to have formulated and placed in operation a limited compensation scheme under which victims of murder or robbery committed by a highway bandit who escaped was paid only by the community which failed to apprehend the criminal.

In this country, the accepted view has been that compensation for an injury inflicted by one person upon another is a civil matter between the parties concerned, capable of settlement in the civil courts by way of an action for damages. In many instances the assailant either is unknown or, if he is known, is without means, in which case a suit would be a futile proceeding.

Compensation schemes under which victims of crime are compensated by the state for personal injuries became effective in 1964, in New Zealand—New Zealand Laws 1963, No. 134—and in England—Command 2323. In our own country, the State of California last year adopted a compensation scheme and thus became the first State in the Nation to give limited compensation to the victims of a crime.

The principle of compensation for innocent victims of crime has substantial support in this country. U.N. Ambassador Goldberg in his James Madison lecture at New York University Law School pointed out that the victim of a crime of violence "has been denied the protection of the laws in a very real sense, and society should assume some responsibility for making him whole"—39 New York University Law Review 224 April, 1964.

I am proposing to create a Federal Violent Crime Compensation Commission. This would be a three-man tribunal. The Chairman and the two other members, chosen because of their legal experience, are to be appointed for 8-year staggered terms by the President with

the advice and consent of the Senate. The Commission will consider the claims of those injured by criminal violence occurring in areas where the Federal Government exercises general police power. It will be the Commission's function to examine the evidence presented to it both to determine what level of compensation should be granted and whether, in fact, the person making the claim was truly an innocent victim. The Commission would be authorized to order payment for: First, expenses actually and reasonably incurred as a result of the injury or death of the victim; second, loss of earning power; third, pecuniary loss to the dependents of deceased victims; fourth, pain and suffering of the victim; and fifth, other pecuniary loss resulting from the personal injury or death of the victim which the Commission determines reasonable. Compensation would not be awarded in excess of \$25,000 in any case. The determination of the Commission is to be considered final; there will be no right of appeal. Application for compensation must be made within 2 years of injury or death.

The bill applies only to those areas of the country where the Federal Government exercises general police power. These are the District of Columbia and the special maritime and territorial jurisdictions of the United States. In no way will this legislation impinge upon the jurisdiction and rights of the States, but it should serve as a model of progressive criminal legislation for the 50 States of this Union.

Compensation would not be awarded in two situations: First, if the victim is a relative of the offender; or, second, if the victim was at the time of the injury or death living with the offender as his wife or her husband or as a member of the offender's household.

Mr. Speaker, I have commented on some of the principal provisions of H.R. 11894. It is my sincere hope that hearings will be held, that the committee will report favorably, and that this Congress will follow the promptings of fairness and social necessity in enacting this meritorious legislation.

SECURITY OF THE HOUSE CHAMBER RELATES TO NEED FOR STAFF IDENTIFICATION CARDS

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call to the attention of the House that tonight we shall be addressed by the President. He will deliver his state of the Union message. I am reminded that the security of this Chamber will be very much involved. I am also reminded that on the opening day of the 1st session of the 89th Congress the question of security came up. It was as a result of an incident that occurred on that date that I submitted House Resolution 261. That resolution called for the

issuance of identification cards to employees of the Members of House and the committees on Capitol Hill.

The resolution was reported and adopted by the House on July 1 of 1965. To date no identification cards have been issued.

I feel that it is important for us to provide our employees on the House side with means of identification, particularly during these days when security is so important, so that they can have ready identification for those who have the responsibility of security. The identification cards would also be a means of convenience for employees, because with such identification they could be identified readily in the community in which they are working.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just take this occasion to remind the House that it is important for us to give our employees these identification cards, and I hope that they will be issued soon.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE PEOPLE OF CHAD ON THEIR INDEPENDENCE DAY CELEBRATION

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, these first few weeks of January find the continent of Africa going through many experiences, some pleasant, and some otherwise. But even in the midst of all this, it is fitting to take a few moments to pay tribute to the anniversary of one of Africa's newer states. I refer to Chad which celebrated its independence day on January 11. France granted independence to Chad on August 11, 1960, but the national holiday celebrated was first inaugurated on January 11, 1961.

Chad was organized as a military area by France in September 1900, and in 1910 became one of the four territories comprising former French Equatorial Africa. Chad became a fully autonomous member of the French community in 1959, and gained complete independence in 1960.

Since independence, Chad has retained close political and economic ties with France and is a member of the French community and the franc zone. Chad's relations with other African states have been friendly, and she has participated along with the other states of former French Equatorial Africa in a customs union, a postal union, and a mutual defense pact. In addition to membership in the United Nations, Chad is an active member of the African and Malagasy Common Organization and the Organization of African Unity. Relations with the United States have been friendly and both Governments expect the trend to continue.

The Chadian Government is gallantly attempting to overcome some of the country's economic difficulties which arise largely from Chad's landlocked position and the scarcity of known

mineral resources. Chad is self-sufficient in food production and is now engaging in a program of crop diversification. Though cotton accounts for more than 80 percent of Chad's cash crop income, the outlook is bright for increased revenue from the growing fishing industry. Chad's growing foreign trade and expenditures on technical and agricultural training for its people are firm and definite indications that the Government is committed to progress and internal stability.

I am sure my colleagues all join me in congratulating the people of Chad and in wishing them best wishes on their anniversary in the fervent hope that they find the inner satisfaction for which they have worked so hard and which they so richly deserve.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON SHOULD STATE POLICY IN RELATION TO RHODESIA

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, when President Johnson appears in full color this evening to give an accounting of his administration, I hope he will explain to the citizens of this country why he has joined with the leeching British monarchy in an outrageous attempt to strangle and destroy the Government of Rhodesia, which seeks its independence as our forefathers did 190 years ago.

An economic blockade is ordinarily considered to be one step short of hostilities. Has the United States been committed to war, or the support of a war, if the economic boycott fails to bring the Rhodesians to their knees?

British profiteers have refused to stop trading with the Communist Vietcong, with Communist China, and Communist Cuba. Does the U.S. Government have a double, triple, or quadruple standard of morality to be applied in the case of friendly Rhodesia?

Yes; let us have a full-color explanation from Lyndon Johnson as to why this outrageous action has been taken against a friendly government.

Mr. Speaker, on December 17, 1965, on the occasion of British Prime Minister Wilson's conference at the White House in connection with the Rhodesian situation, I sent the following telegram to President Johnson:

Newspapers quote your Assistant Secretary of State, G. Mennen Williams, as stating that British economic penalties should be strong enough to bring down the Southern Rhodesian Government providing Rhodesia cannot get enough imports from "modern-day private buccaneers looking for quick profit."

Williams is also quoted as saying "we believe Britain will continue to apply measures that will be adequate to resolve the situation and we will support those measures."

It takes an inordinate amount of gall for any official of this Government to commit the United States to an economic boycott of Rhodesia when at the same time Britain's

"modern-day private buccaneers looking for a quick profit" are trading with the Communist Vietcong, Communist Cuba, and Communist China.

How can you, Williams, or any other official of this Government, commit the United States to an economic boycott of Rhodesia and at the same time close your eyes to the perfidious trading by the British with the Communists with whom we are at war?

If the purpose of Prime Minister Wilson's trip to this country is to further involve us in Rhodesia, he should be invited to pack his bags, and any commitment to join in a British boycott should be rescinded forthwith. Citizens of this country are entitled to expect integrity on the part of their leaders, not pandering and doubletalk.

As of this date, January 12, 1966, I have had a letter from one of the President's underlings at the White House stating only that the telegram had been received and it would be made available to the President.

SOFT POLICIES OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I have today directed a letter to the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Katzenbach, demanding to know why the Department of Justice, apparently taking encouragement from the usual soft policies of the State Department, has not taken action concerning Herbert Aptheker, a professor from Yale by the name of Lynd, and one other fellow that went over to the southeast Asia theater, in Vietnam, in what, if the newspapermen are correct, appears to be a clear-cut violation of the Logan Act. It seems to me that the U.S. Government should stop applying double standards in cases of this nature and prosecute violations of the Federal statutes.

RYAN RESOLUTION TO CREATE A HOUSE COMMITTEE ON URBAN AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution to create a new House standing committee consisting of 25 members, to be called the Committee on Urban Affairs. During the last session of this Congress we approved the establishment of a new executive department, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, to cope with the staggering problems of urban America. That was a gratifying decision for me because I had fought for the creation of such a department since I entered the Congress, introducing legislation to that end and working for its passage. Logic now demands that the Congress set up in both its Houses a parallel standing Committee on Urban Affairs, with specific

jurisdiction for housing, mass transit, air and water pollution, water supplies and sewage facilities.

More than 130 million Americans live in urban or metropolitan areas at the present time, and the figure is expected to increase dramatically by the end of this decade. It has been predicted that by 1970 as many as 25 million of our 30 million new citizens will settle in cities and metropolitan areas. Our cities are our future.

Yet our cities are plagued by grave ills. In a word they are sick. People are living in decaying and inhuman housing; our schools are dilapidated and overcrowded affecting the quality of the education our youngsters receive; the air is fouled with noxious and clearly hazardous pollutants; pure water and an adequate supply of it is a rarity in many cities; crimes of violence are increasing at a frightening rate so that our citizens are afraid to enter their parks and subways; the streets of our cities are choked with stalled traffic, while public transportation systems wither and die for lack of patronage. The quality of life in the city is perilously close to bestial. Remedies are expensive, but as the crisis of our cities mounts, and intensifies, our cities find they simply do not have the necessary funds to reverse the blight, decay, and deterioration.

In recognition of this the Congress during the last session finally gave the city a spokesman in the President's Cabinet by setting up the new department. This new department, which is now being shaped, is intended to bring order out of the chaos that now characterizes the manner in which we currently deal with our urban problems.

Mr. Speaker, there is a vast array of Federal programs, both new and old, relevant for curing the ailments of our cities and bringing about a revitalization of urban life. But dedication, imagination, and, above all, coordination are mandatory if present Federal efforts and, hopefully, expanded ones in the years ahead are to make our cities and the sprawling urban areas which spill over city, county, and State lines, not only livable but pulsating, viable centers of commerce, education, and culture to nourish all of our people economically, esthetically, and spiritually.

It is not an overstatement to describe the city as this great Nation's domestic frontier as the relentless exodus from rural America continues. At the same time there is a virtual army of people ready and willing to enlist in the front ranks of those who will battle to tame this new frontier. Part of the task of the new department will be to encourage and use this talent (in our neighborhoods, in our colleges and universities, in industry, and in our city halls) to devise new ways of meeting the crisis of our cities. I firmly believe that the action of the Congress during the last session, establishing the new Urban Affairs Department, deepens the commitment and strengthens the resolve of the Federal Government to give increased weight to urban centers in deliberations on overall national policy. The new Department equips the Federal Government more

adequately to participate in the search for and implementation of solutions to urban sickness.

The new Department is designed to pull together all of those Federal programs that can be brought to bear on the problems of our cities. If there is one point on which all serious observers on urban affairs agree, it is that housing, transportation, open space, water and air pollution, and sewage disposal are interdependent problems. We are on a fool's errand if we attempt to solve problems in isolation, such as providing decent, safe housing for our growing urban population but not at the same time considering how water supply, sewage, and other waste disposal, transportation, and traffic control, the availability of open space for restoring the mind and body, and the prevention and elimination of blight from surrounding areas all affect the adequacy of any urban environment. Clearly the new Department will have to address itself to this whole galaxy of problems if the overall impact of Federal programs is to have its desired effect.

Mr. Speaker, it is inevitable that there will be an expansion of the Government's role in this national problem. I believe that the Congress has an important organizational step to take as evidence that we truly understand that urban problems are national problems. That step is to set up a new standing committee—a Committee on Urban Affairs. Logic demands a Committee on Urban Affairs with jurisdiction for urban problems generally and for certain very specific areas to achieve a coordinated response on the part of both the executive and legislative branches.

At the present time the jurisdiction in both branches of Congress for the legion of problems that afflict the cities is scattered throughout a host of standing committees and subcommittees. Urban problems have proliferated at a chaotic rate since the last major congressional reorganization in 1946, yet a committee structure that evolved two decades ago is still being employed to direct the affairs of our cities. There should be a new committee with an overall approach to urban affairs if Congress is to play a proper and creative role in pushing back the urban frontier so that people in our cities can live the good life in the Great Society.

The benefits flowing from the establishment of a Committee on Urban Affairs would be twofold. Congress would profit by being able to have a more modern and effective instrument for overseeing the new Department of Housing and Urban Development, and our cities would be able to deal with one congressional committee instead of half a dozen in seeking assistance for a concerted and effective attack on urban problems.

The responsibilities of this new committee would be broad.

Of the many ills that afflict life in our cities, nothing cries out for action more than that of people trapped in substandard housing and the miserable social conditions that slum housing brings in its train. Under my resolution the Committee on Urban Affairs would be responsible for housing and the related Federal

programs of urban renewal, slum clearance, code enforcement, and community renewal.

In addition, the other proper concerns of the new committee should be mass transportation as it relates to the large population centers of the Nation as well as streets and highways in our urban areas and the enormously complex problem of sewage disposal. Highway planning must be coordinated with the growing need for comfortable, clean, yet swift public transportation facilities if these programs are not to be self-defeating. A massive effort is required to clean up our rivers and streams which too often are open sewers.

Air and water pollution must be given much greater attention in the future than in the past. The control of poisons in our air and water supplies in the years ahead may be critical in determining if the city thrives or only survives. A Committee on Urban Affairs should address itself to the question of waste disposal.

Crisis breeds challenge, and this country faces its greatest challenges today in our cities. Washington, the Nation's Capital, is a textbook illustration of what has happened to the American city.

Mr. Speaker, a Committee on Urban Affairs would be an important vehicle for assuring that the Congress prepares to meet this challenge and for assuring that all our city dwellers—from all income groups—have an equal opportunity to share in the fruits of life in the city which, with vision and care, can be transformed and, indeed, reborn.

Let me close by reiterating as forcefully as I can that our cities need help. The creation of a new standing committee, the Committee on Urban Affairs, will enable the House to play a creative and significant role in providing this help and meeting the challenge of the urban frontier.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the gentleman from New York for his excellent suggestion. I wish to associate myself with his remarks, and I intend to introduce a companion resolution to carry out his proposal for the establishment, in both Houses of the Congress, of a permanent committee to deal with the urban problems of America. Certainly this resolution is timely.

As we look upon the face of America today, we find that 72 percent of the American population is housed in America's urban areas. Less than a century ago the United States was an agricultural country. Today, certainly, we have an urban America.

There are vast problems in our large cities, as the gentleman has quite properly pointed out. It seems to me that a committee of the Congress charged with the express responsibility of guiding legislation to help solve these problems would indeed bring a great deal of economy to the Congress and perhaps a greater understanding of the problems of these cities.

As a Member from a congressional district in the heart of a large metropolis, Chicago, I can fully appreciate the gentleman's concern over the problems of the big cities.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman, and I hope that his proposal will receive early consideration by the House.

Mr. RYAN. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his support and for his interest in my proposal. I hope that the idea of a standing Committee on Urban Affairs will receive widespread support, as the new Department of Housing and Urban Development prepares to take on the tasks which have been assigned to it by the President.

There is a task force at the present time formulating recommendations for the structure and the exact nature of the jurisdiction of the new Federal Department. I hope that its recommendations will be bold and sweeping. The Federal Government must recognize its responsibility to urban areas. The urgent needs of our cities deserve the focus of a standing House committee. Remember the Department of Agriculture is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture. Urban affairs now merit similar attention.

THE QUALITY AND AVAILABILITY OF EDUCATION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. RONCALIO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RONCALIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the quality and availability of education must be the constant concern of those who direct their efforts toward a better society. Service to this goal is the responsibility of every citizen; the necessary commitment of every public official.

The 89th Congress ably met this commitment in the passage of the Elementary-Secondary Education Act and the Higher Education Act which opened the resources of our Federal Government to this common venture. I was happy to support and vote for this legislation.

But concern must be continuing, not diminished by legislative accomplishments of even this scope and magnitude. The success of this, and future legislation, will ultimately rest on the vigilance and service of public servants and conscientious parents and citizens.

It is then with some apprehension that I note a development which threatens disservice to this goal. I refer to certain aspects of the "personality testing" conducted by researchers under the auspices of the Office of Education.

Section 402 of the Civil Rights Act authorizes the Office of Education to conduct a survey and make a report to the President and Congress on the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities because of race, color, religion, or national origin in public educational institutions. Although this specific survey will conclude July 2, 1966, the authorization of researching with public funds is a continuing activity of the Of-

fice of Education and any questions related to this activity should be settled as soon as possible.

Publication of portions of one of these personality tests indicates that the nature of the questions and the method of testing could represent an intrusion on the privacy of the individual, and a potential breach in the personal relationship between parent and child.

Questions asked of students in civil rights testing included: "Who is now acting as your father?" "Who is now acting as your mother?" "Where does most of the money come from that pays for your food, house, and clothing?" "How do you and your friends rate socially in this school?" and several questions on the racial balance a student prefers among his classmates, teachers, and friends.

The special subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee has reviewed other personality tests containing questions of an even more personal nature. These tests include questions on race, religion, family income, compatibility of parents, sexual experiences, and cultural stature of the family in the community.

I do not question the merit of personality testing, but I believe there are several safeguards which should be enacted to strengthen the program and protect the rights of the individual.

I would recommend that the Office of Education exercise its authority to review questions submitted by researchers under grants of public funds. The questions are theoretically reviewed by boards of experts to minimize improprieties. I recommend that they are in fact reviewed, and any questions not likely to serve the general ends of the testing be removed or revised.

The Government Operations Special Subcommittee alleges that there is no evidence that all questions were reviewed. In this situation, the researcher has essentially been given a blank check. The propriety of questions rests on the basis of his personal judgment, although his research is financed by taxpayers' money. The situation is alarming when one considers what abuses could be wrought in its name.

If the authority of the Office of Education is not clear in this regard, then I would recommend enabling legislation to require the Office of Education to review and approve all research testing conducted with public funds.

Second, in view of the fact that participation by schools is voluntary, I recommend that this same privilege be extended to students. Therefore I propose first, each test be strictly voluntary; second, parental consent be obtained for students below college level; third, a copy of the test be made available for inspection by parents, if they wish, before granting consent; fourth, parents be given a clear idea of the nature of the test when consent is sought. The nature of the questions should be made known.

I realize these safeguards will require additional time, but by informing parents of the reasons for testing and specific questions, the researcher will more than

likely win greater support for his efforts. In those cases where parents object, the right of privacy will be respected.

The law recognizes the privileged relationship between lawyer and client; doctor and patient; and priest and parishioner. No less serious and constant is the parent-child relationship. It should never be compromised by the role of teacher and student.

The parent-child relationship is threatened when students are indirectly compelled to answer questions on intimate and personal family matters.

This delicate matter must be studied objectively, with no mind to render researchers powerless to conduct surveys. It is no inquisition; no blanket condemnation of research effort or tests.

Because we recognize the merit of good testing, we seek to strengthen the effectiveness of good tests and preclude the disasters inherent in bad testing and in compulsory testing. We must not presume to preempt the authority of experts in their own field of study, but rather accomplish two ends.

First. We can correct any future "sins of omission" in the determination of authority by formalizing the policy of review and revision by the Office of Education, a policy to be enforced by the Office itself.

Second. We can strengthen the effectiveness of the tests by bringing parents in as cooperative and knowledgeable partners in research.

Third. We can protect the rights of privacy of those who elect not to answer what they consider highly confidential subject matter.

I would respectfully request that my colleagues carefully study the findings of the Government Operations Special Subcommittee with a mind to clarifying this matter.

I would also respectfully request that Mr. Harold Howe II, who has just assumed his post as Commissioner of Education, direct the attention of his staff to a serious study of this issue with a determination to remove the apprehensions of so many Americans.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE JOHNSON-McNAMARA STRATEGIC BOMBER CUTBACK TO DETERMINING A SOVIET SURPRISE ATTACK ON THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, accompanying these remarks is a table entitled "Comparative Table Illustrating Possible Impact of Johnson-McNamara Bomber Cutback on U.S. Strategic Retaliatory Capability Under Varying Assumptions." I must emphasize that neither the table nor these remarks contain classified information of any kind. The figures are not to be construed as evidencing actual U.S. stockpile quantities of nuclear weapons, nor the deliverable megatonnage of any particular weapons systems. Rather, the figures

are either published by the Government, nonofficial estimates found in usually reliable publications, consolidations, reconciliations and extrapolations for either or both or simply arbitrary assumptions for comparison purposes.

The basic purpose of the figures on the table are to illustrate that whether or not our strategic bomber payloads are calculated at 10 megatons, or 400 percent greater at 40 megatons, even this large discrepancy in the assumption results in only a minor difference in the actual percentage reduction in deliverable megatonnage the proposed cutback will result in. Under the 40-megaton assumption, we will end up with a 29-percent cutback leaving us with only 71 percent of our current capability. Under the 10-megaton assumption, we will end up with a 22-percent cutback leaving us with only 78 percent of our current capability. The difference of 400 percent in assumptions makes only a 7-percent difference in the size of the cutback.

Moreover, if the judgment of former Strategic Air Command Commander Gen. Curtis LeMay is correct, and the proposed TFX bomber proves inadequate as a substitute for the bombers being eliminated, the cutback in deterrent will be even more drastic. As indicated by the table, it will amount to a 58-percent cutback under the 40-megaton assumption or a 48-percent cutback under the 10-megaton assumption. Of the untried, as yet even undesigned TFX bomber, General LeMay has publicly stated:

This will be inadequate to do the job for several reasons * * * insufficient ranges, insufficient size. It just is not big enough.

Attention again is directed to the table and its last line which illustrates that under the most optimistic of the assumptions Secretary McNamara's claim of a present 3 or 4 to 1 U.S. strategic superiority over Soviet strategic forces would drop to 2.34 or 3.12 to 1, while under the most pessimistic assumption it would plummet to 1.26 or 1.68 to 1.

It is clear that Mr. Johnson and Mr. McNamara still see a need for U.S. strategic retaliatory forces to deter Soviet surprise attack. Otherwise they would simply eliminate them rather than reduce them.

This need is based on the repeated assertions of Soviet leaders that communism shall dominate the world. Marxist-Leninist dogma compels these leaders to carry forward a program of world domination. Further, it charges them to carry it forward with maximum haste, utilizing the highest degree of force which can be employed without provoking retaliatory action that would impose unacceptable damage to the Communist homeland and base of power. If they do not do so, they are guilty of the Communist sin of deviation from dogma.

The principal—perhaps the only—reason for U.S. strategic forces is to have the capability to impose unacceptable damage on the Communist homeland which, in fact, deters Communist leaders from a dogmatic decision to strike us to expedite the program of world domi-

nation. Our strategic forces are realistically based on an understanding of this Communist doctrine and are in realistic response to it.

If these forces are eliminated or reduced to a point where Communist leaders calculate they are capable only of imposing "acceptable" damage, then deterrence fails and the Soviets are compelled to strike us.

To avoid this consequence, the United States must continually and correctly answer two basic questions: "What does it take to deter the Soviets?" and "Do we have it?" We have continually and correctly done so up to now. At least, any miscalculation has been on the upside, rather than the downside, otherwise we would have been attacked.

What about the future?

Will these Johnson-McNamara manipulations leave us with or without sufficient strikeback damage imposing capability to continue deterring the Soviets from a decision to strike us? Put another way, will they leave us with what the Kremlin calculates as a capability to continue to impose "unacceptable" damage on them, or will they leave us with only a capability the Kremlin calculates can impose "acceptable" damage? Apparently the President and his Defense Secretary have the feeling the Kremlin will remain deterred. If they are wrong and the move invites a surprise nuclear attack, Secretary McNamara himself last February told the House Armed Services Committee that such an attack could kill as many as 149 million Americans. Thus the lives of that many Americans may ride on the correctness of their judgment. Yet neither official has given the American people the slightest clue as to what they base this most vital of all defense and survival judgments upon.

On the one hand, Aleksei N. Kosygin and Leonid I. Brezhnev—the new Soviet rulers—are superbly equipped correctly to assess both the damage their surprise attack might do the United States and the damage our surviving retaliatory force might do to them in return. Lieutenant General Brezhnev in 1961 was declared a "hero of the Soviet Union" for his outstanding service in the space and missile program. Kosygin played a key role in running the country's economic system during the Khrushchev years.

On the other hand, President Johnson has never claimed expertise in the area of assessing strategic force capabilities. He relies on Secretary McNamara's judgment and advice. How good is Secretary McNamara's judgment on strategic force levels now that he has had almost 5 years on-the-job training in defense matters? It can be considered no more infallible than any of his other judgments which, in the past, on some very vital defense issues have proved quite questionable. Examples:

His following statement October 2, 1964, on the Vietnam war:

The major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965 * * * by the end of this year (1964) * * * the U.S. program should have progressed to the

point where 1,000 U.S. military personnel can be withdrawn.

The Senate Armed Forces Subcommittee report of August 1965 concluding that shortages of supplies have existed in Vietnam despite the Secretary's claim to the contrary.

His leadership participation in the Cuban crisis settlement which failed to obtain on-site inspection for removal of Soviet missiles.

Downgrading of the role and influence of the Joint Chiefs of Staff during the McNamara regime.

The Secretary's dogged opposition to nuclear propulsion for new aircraft carriers.

The steady deterioration of relationships with our NATO allies during his tenure of office.

His scheme of reorganization of Army divisions which necessitated "re-reorganization" and delay in getting troops to Vietnam and which has resulted in several other divisions becoming sadly unbalanced for lack of infantrymen.

His part in the still controversial and partially obscured TFX contract award.

His arbitrary and highhanded merger and downgrading of Reserve and National Guard forces.

DOD's retirement of the U.S. stockpile of 24-megaton nuclear bombs.

DOD's scrapping of plans for such weapons systems as Pluto, Skybolt, Dinosoar, and the B-70.

His redeployment of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe away from points where they can be used immediately against surprise invaders.

The Secretary's insistence that potential antimissile and antisatellite defense weapons be kept in R. & D. rather than installed.

Further, as to the Vietnam war:

As late as May 1965, the Defense Secretary fixed \$700 million a year as the added dollars needed for the war. A few months later, the costs began to run up into the billions. Now the Congress is to be asked for an additional \$12.5 billion.

In mid-1964, with U.S. casualties rising, the Defense Secretary was insisting that Vietnam was not a war and that American soldiers being killed there were not in combat; but were advisers and instructors.

In 1964 there was a flurry caused by complaints of U.S. fliers that their old, slow aircraft were crashing, losing wings, falling apart. Congress was told the B-26's and T-28's involved had been carefully tested and were performing outstandingly. Then later the fighter-bombers were grounded and it was acknowledged that some might have had structural defects.

When Congress complained about the use of World War II planes rather than jets, it was told that new jets were not suited to this war, that propeller-driven aircraft were better. Now a growing share of the Air Force and Navy planes in use in Vietnam are jets.

Secretary McNamara's habitual and profligate misuse of "numbers game" techniques which deceive himself and

result in misstatement of defense capabilities. Example:

His claim to have increased by 45 percent the number of combat ready Army divisions. The claim conveys the impression of an Army increase of nearly one-half; that is, a boost of from 14 pre-McNamara divisions to 20 or 21 divisions, and a manpower increase of almost 400,000 over the Army's previous 900,000 level. In actuality, at the time of the claim he had added only 63,273 men—a 7-percent boost. The arithmetic on division numbers is even more revealing. Under Eisenhower, 3 of the Army's 14 divisions were considered in training. McNamara subtracted these from the 14 to get 11 divisions against which to calculate his percentage of increase. He then produced three new combat ready divisions by the simple expedient of issuing the "in-training" divisions additional equipment and relabeling them combat ready. The two more divisions needed to get 16 to reach the "magic 45-percent increase" came out of thin air. They simply were created by reshuffling manpower from existing divisions to newly created ones and classifying them "combat ready," too. The final easy step was to divide 11 into 5 to produce the magic 45 percent.

In assessing whether the Johnson-McNamara manipulations reducing the Nation's strategic capabilities will leave us sufficient power to threaten retaliatory damage sufficient to deter the Kremlin leaders many factors must be considered. Among them are these:

First. The U.S.S.R. places great emphasis on large yield weapons for strategic deterrence. Its arsenal stocks them heavily. It has tested a 57-ton megaton weapon and announced the ability to fabricate 100-megaton warheads. It has the large missiles needed to deliver them. Undoubtedly in their eyes the creditability of our deterrent threat dwindles because of our major shift from aircraft delivering 40 megatons to missiles delivering only 1 megaton.

Second. The U.S.S.R. claims success in developing antiaircraft and antimissile defenses able to hit a fly in the sky. It proceeds with a vigorous program to install them at many strategic locations. It is argued by some that installations of this nature are significant because they signal an intention to strike first, then utilize the defensive weapons to minimize retaliatory damage.

Third. Success in war and therefore success in deterring a war requires a substantial amount of overkill or excess capability. Our deterrent force must both survive and penetrate enemy territory with sufficient undamaged aircraft and missiles to inflict unacceptable damage—even after suffering substantial reductions. These reductions include: Damage by the enemy's first strike, malfunctions, accidents, attrition during flight, destruction while over enemy territory, missed targets, and so on. For example: During World War II we manufactured a quantity of bullets 65 times that of the entire population of the Axis powers and 2,000 depth charges for

every enemy submarine. For every enemy submarine "killed" an average of 1,500 depth charges were expended. Compare this 1,500-to-1 ratio with the Secretary's 3 or 4 to 1.

Fourth. It is reasonable to assume the Soviets assign some realistic diminution factor to our retaliatory capability arising from our recurring need to divert resources to troubled areas such as the Dominican Republic and Vietnam.

Fifth. It is reasonable to assume the Soviets assign some realistic diminution factor to the credibility of our deterrent, not only from repeated Kennedy-Johnson administration moves to scale it down in size, but from related administration policies, such as the 50-percent cutback in fissionable material production, large slashes in the military budget, wide-ranging activities of the U.S. Disarmament Agency, and consistently reiterated presidential fears of escalation, proliferation, and accidental war.

Sixth. The area of the Soviet Union is some 8.6 million square miles. The satellite countries add further to this figure. The area of the United States is 3.6 million square miles. The basic strategic coverage load on the United States by this measure thus exceeds that of the Soviets by over 2 to 1.

Seventh. The high density population and industrial concentration characteristics of the United States compared to those of the Soviets places a relatively smaller strategic load on the U.S.S.R. than upon us.

Eighth. The heavy odds that the Soviets will initiate a surprise first strike attack against us, rather than the United States striking first against them, further lessens the Soviet strategic load.

Ninth. The McNamara 2- or 3-to-1 ratio applies only to the Soviet threat. Such substantial megatonnage as increasingly must be reserved to deter Red China's growing nuclear arsenal must be

deducted from, and therefore diminish, the U.S. side of this equation.

Tenth. The fact that the Soviets tend to accept rather large damage factors before, in their own minds, they classify them as unacceptable. In World War II they readily accepted 25 million human fatalities and the destruction of 40 percent of their industrial capacity without considering the combined loss unacceptable damage.

According to testimony in House Armed Services Committee files up to 149 million American lives can be lost unless surprise nuclear attack upon the United States is deterred. With a national population of 195 million people, this means each of us has a 76.4 percent chance of being one of those fatalities.

That is precisely what is at stake—our lives. Each of us has that bet on whether President Johnson and Secretary McNamara know what they are doing and are correctly answering the questions: "What does it take to deter the Soviets?" and "Will we have it after the cutbacks are made?"

Considering the fallibilities of Mr. McNamara's judgments, the many considerations involved in answering the questions, and what each of us has at stake here, we have an absolute right to far better assurances than the President and his Secretary have given that they proceed with wisdom.

The administration's duty to the Nation to furnish this information is clear and it is challenged to do so, without declassifying military secrets, just as I have refrained from utilizing classified material to make the challenge.

Unless and until it does satisfactorily and independent judgments can be made, the only safe assumption is that the projected lowering of present U.S. strategic capabilities to 71 percent of their existing levels is deadly risky business and must be vigorously opposed.

Comparative table illustrating possible impact of Johnson-McNamara bomber cutback on U.S. strategic retaliatory capability under varying assumptions

	1-megaton missile payload assumption comparison for 40-megaton and 10-megaton bomber payload assumptions with and without availability of 210 TFX bombers			
	With TFX available		Without TFX available ¹	
	40 megatons	10 megatons	40 megatons	10 megatons
Strategic Force now:				
680 B-52's and B-58's	27,200	6,800		
1,350 missiles	1,350	1,350		
Total	28,550	8,150		
Johnson-McNamara alterations:				
Less:				
425 bombers eliminated	17,000	4,250		
Subtotal	11,550	3,900	11,500	3,900
Add:				
360 missiles	360	360	360	360
210 TFX bombers	8,400	2,100	0	0
New total	20,310	6,360	11,860	4,260
Percent reduction in net megatonnage	29 percent	22 percent	58 percent	48 percent
Percent of "new" force to "present" force level	71 percent	78 percent	42 percent	52 percent
New U.S. to U.S.S.R. strategic superiority ratio based on McNamara claim of "3 or 4 to 1" present ratio	2.13 or 2.84 to 1	2.34 or 3.12 to 1	1.26 or 1.68 to 1	1.56 or 2.08 to 1

¹ Gen. Curtis LeMay states the proposed TFX bomber will be "inadequate to do the job." Its potential megatonnage is eliminated from consideration in these two columns.

BAY COUNTY, MICH., BAR ASSOCIATION VOICES SUPPORT OF OUR MILITARY FORCES IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most every Member of this House returned from his home district with expressions of loyalty and patriotism on behalf of constituents or constituent organizations within the district he represents with respect to our international situation.

Recently the Bay County, Mich., Bar Association adopted a very splendid resolution in support of our forces who are struggling on the field of battle to hold back the Red tide.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE BAY COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION

Whereas the Armed Forces of the United States of America, in the interest of freedom and liberty, are engaged in an armed and bloody conflict with the Communist Vietcong and North Vietnam in southeast Asia; and

Whereas there have been in recent weeks and months, obstructive public demonstrations by sundry groups and individuals in the United States supporting the aforesaid Communist enemy, such as the flying of Vietcong flags, burning of draft cards, the attempted obstruction of troop train movements, drives to collect money, supplies and blood for said enemy, which is or may be injurious to the morale of our troops, some of whom may overlook the fact that said activities constitute the viewpoint of but a small minority of people: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Bay County Bar Association does and it hereby congratulates the members of the Armed Forces of the United States for their gallant and heroic efforts in southeast Asia in the defense of our country and freedom and further, that said bar association extends its unswerving support to our Armed Forces for their speedy and victorious termination of hostilities; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of Defense of the United States of America.

COOPERATION WITHIN THE FREE WORLD

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLBORN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, now that the United States has agreed to cooperate fully in the embargo on Rhodesia, the time has come to halt British and other free world shipments of vital supplies to Communist Cuba.

The shipment of British oil and Canadian wheat to Cuba strengthens that Communist base just off our shores, a base from which revolution and terror are being exported to other Latin American lands. We recall that it was from Cuba, only 3 years ago, that Soviet leaders sought to get a nuclear drop on the United States.

Since 1963, however, 83 vessels carrying the British flag, 52 Lebanese ships, and a number of other free world carriers have landed supplies in Cuba—supplies which help to keep communism operating there. These figures were made public by the U.S. Maritime Administration in December.

Britain, thus, is helping Cuba, where a large part of the populace has been forced to flee Communist terror and tyranny. On the other hand, not a single British civilian or soldier has been killed in Rhodesia, which rebelled against British rule.

Surely our administration should insist that Britain and the others of our allies cooperate with us as we have with them. A free world embargo of Cuba should be proclaimed at once.

"THERE IS A TIME FOR DECISION"

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on October 7 of last year, Mr. Herbert V. Prochnow delivered an address at DePauw University, entitled "There Is a Time for Decision." Mr. Prochnow is president of the First National Bank of Chicago and the purpose of the address was in connection with the "Dr. Paul L. Morrison Fund in Political Economy," and Mr. Prochnow was one of the visiting professors.

His address is quite provocative and raises some very important questions as to our economy. The address follows:

THERE IS A TIME FOR DECISION

(An address by Herbert V. Prochnow, president, the First National Bank of Chicago)

(NOTE.—The "Dr. Paul L. Morrison Fund in Political Economy" was established in 1961 in honor of Dr. Morrison. It is designed to bring to DePauw University political economists of international prominence to conduct seminars and to lecture to students and faculty. Dr. Prochnow is the fifth visiting professor to appear at DePauw under this program.)

In the fall of 1914, the somber shadow of war fell across the world. After 4 fateful years, a war-weary mankind celebrated an armistice in a spirit of triumph. But the brave new world for which men were giving their lives eluded the grasp of the statesmen. Dictatorships sprang up. Communist revolutions erupted. Currencies were destroyed. The colonial system tottered.

Then came the 1920's, when we spoke lyrically of a new era with depression impossible and prosperity inevitable. But the towering structure of prosperity collapsed. We were caught in the debris of a disastrous

market debacle. Economic depression overtook the world. Unbelievably, we then began the grim enterprise of a second World War, engulfing almost all of mankind, and ending only when the terrifying clouds had left behind their dead at Hiroshima. The last great empires were shattered and whatever stability they had provided in the world was gone. Reasonable certainty in international affairs had come to an end. The world lay half in ruins. Dozens of new nations, inexperienced in self-government, struggled for survival as they faced poverty, disease, and illiteracy. There was an alarming drift to communism as men and women desperately sought economic security. In only a few years, communism swept over one-third of the world's population and one-fourth of the earth's surface. The idea that the progress of mankind is inevitable was proved false.

Those were dark and disillusioning days. And yet, as we now know, the raw materials of economic and social renewal were present in Western Europe, waiting only to be given leadership and American financial assistance to make this in less than two decades one of the great areas of strength in the world.

Today, only one-half century since World War I, we have become the most powerful nation on earth. We have become the finest illustration in history of how a people enrich life and raise their whole level of economic well-being when they are given justice, liberty, and incentive. However, as we look back over these years with their booms and depressions, the massive loss of men and property in two world wars, the rise of communism, the dissolution of great empires, the creation of dozens of new nations, and the development of nuclear power, we may well agree with Alfred North Whitehead that "the progress of civilization is not wholly a uniform drift toward better things." This half-century was a time of triumph and tragedy.

We may ask ourselves, what are our responsibilities in a free society which in less than a lifetime witnesses such revolutionary changes? More than 2,200 years ago a philosopher said that "for everything there is a season, a time to break down and a time to build up; a time to keep silence and a time to speak; a time for war and a time for peace." There is a time for everything. For what, we may ask, is this the time? What are the issues for which the time has now arrived? What are the problems for which we should say, "Now is the time to discuss them. Now is the time for their solution. Now is the time for decision. Now is the time for action." Consider then some of the problems and issues confronting our people.

The men who laid the foundation of this country had definite convictions regarding the objectives of a free people. The primary objective was to assure that the rights of every human being would be safeguarded and that he would have the opportunity to develop his talents and capacities fully.

From the time of Aristotle and Plato, men have earnestly debated the role of government in a nation's economic life. There has never been a time in American history when government has not participated in our economic life. However, the role of government has not only changed; it has also expanded over the years. Looking at the record of the past, we may ask whether the role of government will continue to expand as it has since the founding of the Republic. A few questions may indicate the probable trend. Will scientific progress increase with far-reaching effects on industry, communication, travel, and employment, so that those affected will seek government assistance? Will uncertainties continue to arise in our economic life for different groups? Will government be

expected to provide remedies for these problems? Will the social security program grow smaller, stand still, or grow larger? Will the millions of persons in our rapidly growing metropolitan centers demand better coordination and development by government of water resources, sewage plants, educational facilities, and streets and highways?

Will rising incomes of the people lead them to demand more hospitals, and medical and recreational facilities as they have in the past? Will the increasing development of atomic energy for peace-time purposes lead to the establishment of agencies for its regulation and inspection? Will vastly increased highway and transportation requirements in the next 10 years lead to large expenditures by government? One could continue these questions, but the probable increasing role of government in the years ahead seems clear.

And yet, the overriding economic fact is that it is not government, but modern industry, with massive automated and power-driven equipment, producing a continuous flow of goods and services for the economic enrichment of man that is the great social instrument of our time. The enormous production of wealth, widely distributed to the masses, has far surpassed the expansion of the role of government. With the broad distribution of wealth, we have found that in the very process of producing wealth, industry is making its market while it is making its goods. Now is the time to understand more clearly what this massive American industrial plant with its vast outflowing of goods means to the Nation as it gives economic freedom in increasing measure to our people.

If we maintain the incentives for the continuing expansion and modernization of our industrial plant, it is certain to make available to the masses the comforts, conveniences, and cultural advantages that once were the privilege of the few. In many respects this is the major economic development of our time. It has destroyed decisively the idea that this Nation has reached economic maturity. It is giving the people that economic freedom from which the higher values of a society flow. It is enabling us to cultivate increasingly those values that lie beyond economics.

With something less than a prophetic revelation, Karl Marx once said that capitalism would impoverish the people until nothing would remain but masses of "exploited proletariat" and a few "exploiters." Few men have been so wrong, so completely, and so rapidly.

Modern industry also has outdated much of the economic philosophy of Thorstein Veblen. You will recall that Veblen looked upon business leaders as the modern leisure class. He said that the relation of the leisure class to the Nation's economy is "a relation of acquisitiveness, not production; of exploitation, not of serviceability." Veblen spoke critically of a society in which the rich have conspicuous leisure to indulge in conspicuous consumption. However, conspicuous consumption by the few is not the characteristic of the American economy. It is not the few with conspicuous leisure who crowd the highways on Sunday afternoons with 72 million automobiles.

It is not the ostentatious consumption of a few rich persons that has put 73 million television sets into American homes. It is not the conspicuous consumption and waste of a small number of rich persons that sends 2 million people abroad each year, makes over 20 million Americans stockholders, and put hundreds of millions of appliances into tens of millions of American homes to free men and women of drudgery and raise their standard of living. It has not been government, but modern business organization using the greatest industrial plant in the world that has made this economic miracle possible. It

has been billions of dollars of savings and investment poured into modern production facilities that has magnified and multiplied the physical efforts of labor so that man can be liberated from poverty.

We have created on a large scale a new economic instrument in our society, the modern business organization, with professional management bringing together men of skill and knowledge with every type of equipment at their command to produce a continuous flow of goods and services for the people. It is time we recognized this significant development and realized that we are witnessing now the social ministry of a machine civilization. It is one thing for a John Ruskin to warn us of the social perils of a machine civilization, but it is no less important for us to be aware of its great social possibilities. The modern business enterprise is the driving force that has made possible the world's greatest consumer market. It has raised the standard of living of our people to the highest level in history. It has produced a complex array of equipment for the Nation's defense in a turbulent world. It has paid a large share of the Government's bills.

Over 400,000 businesses begin each year and almost as many go out of existence. Millions of American consumers in the marketplace determine which products and services they want. They determine therefore which business organizations will succeed and which will fail. No central government makes these decisions. Each day the American people by their choices provide the discipline in the marketplace which determines the direction of the Nation's economic life.

This country was at one time primarily an agricultural Nation. We have moved in our history from a simple pastoral era into a complex technological society. Today only 7 or 8 percent of the labor force is in agriculture. As men left agriculture, they became industrial workers. Professional, technical, and managerial employees are now the largest group in our working population. They are vital to the continuance of modern enterprise. Of equal significance, the largest single group of employees today consists of teachers. This is a fundamental change in our society and it will accelerate.

The changing character of our employed groups will have a far-reaching impact on the Nation. With the multiplication of professional skills and talents, we shall be bolder in attacking new economic frontiers and in making economic advances. The gap between the advanced and the developing nations may well be further widened with all the problems that follow. No nation can now advance satisfactorily in the competitive struggle between nations unless it rapidly increases the number of its well-educated persons. The untrained and the unskilled are unfortunately liabilities in the economic and social progress of a society. In the early development of a nation the clearing of forests, the building of roads, the cultivation of fields all proceed before a society is finally able to create a skilled, technically trained people.

Thirty years ago only 1 out of every 8 employed Americans had been to high school. Today 4 out of 5 children of high school age attend high school. Thirty years ago only 4 percent of the young people of college age were in college. Today the figure is 35 percent for the entire country and closer to 50 percent for metropolitan areas. An estimated 54 million students, or almost 28 percent of the total population, are enrolled in schools and colleges this fall. Approximately 5.4 million are enrolled in colleges and professional schools. We shall spend about \$39 billion on education in the current school year.

In our educational revolution we are creating the producers of modern society—persons who come to their responsibilities with

knowledge and with engineering, scientific, economic, and technical skills. They provide the scientists, doctors, accountants, teachers, chemists, and production, distribution, legal and economic authorities we need in modern industry. They are the increasing number in an advanced society who work with their minds. We are certain to have vastly increased expenditures for education to maintain leadership in the world.

Consider another problem for which the time for decision may have come. The U.S. dollar is the reserve currency for many nations. The economic and financial strength of this Nation and the integrity of its currency are therefore matters of the first concern. Our responsibility as a great nation has been complicated in recent years by the persistent and large deficit in our balance of payments. We have initiated many arrangements designed to give us more time to solve this problem. The technical skill which produced these arrangements—the huge currency swap transactions with foreign central banks; the various types of Treasury bonds issued to obtain foreign exchange; the increased cooperation of central banks; and the London gold pool—is to be commended.

We are currently engaged in a program of voluntary restraint to redress the deficit in the balance of payments, and current figures indicate that the outflow of funds has been reduced. Let us assume that we are successful in bringing our payments into equilibrium. Let us also assume that in 6 months, or a year, or 2 years from now, we lower the walls of restraint that have held up the outflow of funds. What steps will we have taken to correct the fundamental causes of our current payments problem?

Will the European market still be attractive to Americans for investment? For example, will tens of millions of European homes without central heating still offer an attractive market for manufacturing facilities abroad? Will the one-fourth of all French homes without running water still be a tempting market for the production of appliances in Europe? Will Europe—with only 1 automobile for every 15 persons compared to 1 for every 2.7 persons in the United States—continue to be a profitable field for American investment? Will direct investment abroad by Americans still be attractive? It is in fact to the long-run advantage of this Nation to have profitable, direct investments made abroad by American business. The Nation's welfare might be better served if we placed less of the responsibility for correcting the balance-of-payments deficit on the private sector and more on the public sector of our economy.

Let us assume that the present voluntary restraint program was necessary as a temporary measure. Having thus agreed, can we not also agree that the sooner it is possible to end any program of restraint—either voluntary or compulsory—the better it will be for us and for the world? The ultimate objective of the foreign economic policy of all nations must be the elimination of restrictions to the free flow of capital and goods. Necessary as restraints may seem as temporary measures, they are contrary to the basic principle of increasing economic freedom for men and nations. Moreover, restrictions on the outflow of funds are holding measures. They are not basic corrections of the balance-of-payments deficit.

No other nation can approach in magnitude the industrial power of the United States and its capacity to improve the economic welfare of the people of the world. The gross national product of the United States is approximately twice that of its nearest rival, Russia, and six times that of the third largest economy, West Germany. As we have noted, it has been modern private industry, with its massive, power-driven, automated equipment, which has

been the major instrument for the economic enrichment of our people.

Machines supply 98 percent of the power for our industry. Men are free from the hardest physical labor and drudgery and, in a significant measure, from poverty. Our people have more leisure hours, receive better wages, and have more plant, equipment, and energy-producing facilities working for them than any people in the world. The unusual industrial power and genius of our people can, in the years ahead, also contribute greatly to the economic betterment of all peoples when goods and capital move freely between nations. A machine civilization has the possibility of bringing a new dynamic into the lives of millions of people over the world. Only when we eliminate barriers to the free movement of goods, services, and capital, will we succeed in utilizing most efficiently the skills and imaginations of men everywhere. This is another major economic issue which urgently requires reexamination if this Nation is to solve the problem of its balance of payments deficit and yet make the contribution to world stability and progress which the peculiar industrial genius of its people might assure.

There is a growing acceptance now of the philosophy that the economy of a nation operates best if credit at all times is relatively easy with interest rates kept low. Is this philosophy sound? Would we maintain that the economy of a nation operates best if the supply of labor is relatively easy with wage rates kept low, especially since labor costs in so many products constitute a large part of the total cost? Would we maintain that the economy of a nation operates best if the supply of farm products or raw materials is relatively plentiful with their prices kept low? Would we maintain that it is sound economic policy to single out one item—labor, steel, automobiles, farm products, raw materials, or credit—and seek to keep its supply plentiful and its cost low? The marketplace should determine the level of interest rates, wages and rent, and the prices of steel, farm products and raw materials. It is not a question of low price, or high price, but the right price at any given time. The right price is the price determined in the market. The time is here for an intellectually mature approach to this economic problem.

Do we as a nation also need to set down more clearly our priorities for expenditures? For example, we are spending billions of dollars in space exploration. These programs may be more important to the Nation's welfare than an expenditure for any other purpose. And yet, it is doubtful whether our people understand the urgent necessity for these programs in relation to many other heavy commitments such as Vietnam.

Which expenditures now should have priority over the critical need for more and better schools and housing to help relieve present racial tensions?

By 1980, it is estimated that we shall have 50 million more automobiles on our highways. The number of American families increased 20 percent from 1950 to 1962, but the number of car-owning families increased by 60 percent. If our population increase continues at its present rate annually, we shall have almost 350 million people by the end of the next 35 years using 300 million cars. Obviously, these increases do not seem sustainable. How far can these trends continue with the absorption of land and the staggering expenditures for tollways? Water resources constitute another serious problem. The time is here for intelligent discussion of what the priorities should be for meeting some of the great needs of our society, such as educational facilities, housing, transportation, water resources, space exploration, and halting the deterioration in

the heart of our great metropolitan centers where tens of millions now live.

Our international relations also constitute an area we need to reexamine constantly and critically. World leadership has brought with it responsibilities we had neither anticipated nor sought. The shattering of the great world empires following two world wars has resulted in the emergence of dozens of new nations with over 1 billion persons. This may be the single most important economic and political development of our time. In their struggle against poverty and ignorance, these people will constitute for years a continuing threat to the peace of the world. We cannot ignore this threat nor is there any assurance that we can adequately meet it.

With only 195 million people, can this Nation possibly solve problems of poverty, illiteracy, disease, inadequate tax systems, inflation, and land reform for almost 1½ billion people? Eight hundred million of these people live in India, Pakistan, Indonesia, and southeast Asia, 50 million in the Middle East, 240 million in Africa and 230 million in Latin America. Today, African and Asian nations represent over 53 percent of the United Nations membership. The 36 African nations alone represent almost one-third. If current population trends continue for only 35 years, there will be 5 to 6 billion people in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and they will constitute well over 80 percent of the world's population. It is estimated that more than 500 million children of school age in the world are not now enrolled in any school. Are we to conclude that the opportunity of these nations to defeat poverty, illiteracy, hunger and disease will steadily become less probable in the years ahead?

In India alone there are nearly 500 million persons, one-seventh of the world's population. The increase in population is between 10 and 12 million annually. The birth rate is among the highest in the world. Eight out of ten persons are illiterate. The overwhelming majority do not have enough income to feed themselves adequately.

An estimated 40 percent of the people must live on 10 cents or less a day. In New Delhi, it requires over 10 cents a day to buy even enough rice for a minimum diet. Many persons have bad water supplies and no sewage systems. Even in the large cities, only one-half the houses at the most have sewage disposal. An estimated 1 million people in Calcutta have no homes at all. Seventy percent of the people of India are engaged in farming. Over 90 percent of the 600,000 villages are without electric power.

With the exception of Red China, here in one nation of 500 million persons in an area about two-fifths the size of the continental United States there is the greatest poverty, unemployment, illiteracy and mass misery of any place on earth. India is engaged in a struggle for survival. There are major food shortages. Inflation is bad. Food, machinery, and raw materials must be imported on a large scale, resulting in heavy trade deficits. Large crash development programs by the government have resulted in substantial budget deficits and heavy borrowing from the central bank. No other nation has so many unemployed or underemployed. Some sources estimate that perhaps 40 million persons have work less than one-half day a week. The United States and several other nations are pouring many hundreds of millions of dollars of aid annually into India in a struggle to assure some economic progress for the nation at the same time it seeks to maintain the freedom of its people. Our total economic aid to India has probably exceeded \$6 billion. Counterpart funds, the Indian currency we receive in payment of our large so-called sales of agricultural products, have been accumu-

lated to our credit in India in amounts that run into the equivalent of billions of dollars.

However, India is only one country. Nearby is Pakistan with 100 million persons with comparable problems. To the southeast is Indonesia with 100 million people. There are other nations in the Far East—the Philippines, Korea, Vietnam, Burma, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia—with equally difficult economic and political problems. With the possible exception of Israel, there are an additional 50 million persons in the nations of the Middle East—Iran, Iraq, Jordan, and others—who are struggling against illiteracy and poverty.

Two entire continents, Africa and Latin America, have come forward as areas whose economic and political problems require attention.

Historically, the greatest single event of the 1960's may be the political liberation of Africa. This continent is about four times as great in area as the United States, 50 percent larger than Soviet Russia and larger than all of North America. It is almost 5,000 miles long and 4,500 miles wide—with an area as large as the United States, Western Europe, India, and Red China combined. Ninety-seven percent of the 240 million people are of African origin and they speak 700 languages or dialects. Approximately 85 percent of the people cannot read or write, and 62 million of the 83 million children of school age are not in school. The average annual income of \$132 per person is less than that of any other continent.

This continent has over 40 percent of the world's hydroelectric potential and one-fifth of its forests. For some years Africa has provided the free world with nearly all its industrial diamonds, more than one-half of its newly mined gold, one-fourth of its copper and important quantities of lead, zinc, manganese, iron, cobalt, bauxite, platinum, uranium, and other metals. Practically the entire world's supply of columbite, a rare metal used in jet engines, comes from Nigeria. There are also important new discoveries of oil. The continent has nearly every mineral and can produce almost every crop. Here are great resources invaluable to the industrial expansion of the free world in the years ahead.

Today there are 56 nations in Africa. Although each of the 56 countries is at a different level of economic and political development, there is overall a potentially explosive nationalism. Unfortunately, as Arnold Toynbee has indicated, freedom came to Africa while the masses of its people south of the Sahara were still living in a pre-civilizational state of their development. They are therefore faced with the overwhelming problems of setting up governments with little or no experience to prepare them for this difficult responsibility.

Africa as a whole is one of the least developed areas of the world. The continent provides an unfortunate example of poverty, illiteracy, hunger, disease and inadequate medical facilities, industrial skills, and capital. In 22 countries of tropical Africa less than one-half the children go even to the first primary grade in school. Moreover, in these 22 countries an average of 95 percent of the primary schoolchildren never enter a secondary school. To provide elementary school buildings alone might cost two or three times the total national budget of a country and this would not include the expense of running the schools.

Even if there had been no colonization, there is no reason to believe that Africa would have overcome its tragic poverty. There is also no assurance now that if Africa is left to itself it will enter a period of accelerated economic progress. Here then are the ingredients of political instability and revolution. Here also are 240 million persons we

hope will achieve economic progress peacefully within the framework of democracy.

In addition to these undeveloped areas of the world, we need also to evaluate the magnitude of our problems and new commitments in Latin America. Many Latin American nations have had independence for more than a century. There are in Latin America approximately 230 million people in an area about twice the size of the United States. Their average life expectancy is only 45 years compared with 70 years in the United States. The population is increasing at the striking rate of 2.3 percent each year, faster than any other major part of the world, and compared to 1.5 percent for the United States. The cities are growing at the remarkable rate of 5 percent a year, and 3 of the 10 largest cities of the world are now in Latin America—Mexico City, Buenos Aires, and São Paulo.

Over one-half of the labor force of Latin America is engaged in agriculture and yet less than one-fourth of the gross national product comes from this industry, indicating its backwardness. Less than 5 percent of the landowners own 70 percent of the land, and less than 5 percent of the land is cultivated, compared with 18 percent in the United States. In some countries such as Bolivia, Colombia, Peru, and Venezuela less than 3 percent of the land can be cultivated. Only 5 percent of the total land area of South America is suitable for agricultural production compared to 10 percent in the United States and 37 percent in Europe.

Over 50 percent of the adults in Latin America are unable to read or write. Despite Brazil's progress, the illiteracy rate is still over 50 percent. Argentina rates best with only 13 percent. Fifteen million Latin American children are without classrooms. Even in a Latin American nation as advanced as Mexico, it is estimated that more than one-third of the people have no formal education. Forty million of the seventy million children who are 5 to 19 years of age in Latin America do not attend any school. Moreover, the number of children to be educated is increasing at the rate of 5 million every year which is making the problems almost impossible of solution.

Raising the living standards of the present population of 230 million people is a mammoth undertaking, but the problem will be infinitely greater if the population of Latin America continues to grow at the present rate, and more than doubles in a generation. This would be an almost insuperable problem for nations with highly advanced industrial economies, but with economically retarded and politically volatile countries it almost certainly means periods of turmoil and serious trouble for the governments involved.

Many Latin American countries are largely dependent for their export income on one commodity. The biggest single Latin American export is petroleum. Coffee is second. To illustrate, 92 percent of the export income of Venezuela comes from petroleum. Chile receives 65 percent of its export income from minerals. Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Haiti receive 50 to 75 percent of their export income from coffee. Coffee also constitutes from 15 to 30 percent of the exports of Ecuador, Honduras, the Dominican Republic, and Nicaragua. A sharp drop in the prices of these commodities, especially if there are rising prices in the manufactured goods these countries import, results in a severe curtailment of their imports, huge budget deficits, and not infrequently in political instability. Inflation has also been a widespread and serious problem.

What assurance can we have that these nations, many of which are largely unprepared for self-government, do not endanger the peace of the world through revolutions and violence? Who is to provide educational fa-

cilities for hundreds of millions who are illiterate?

How can we assure even the necessary food when per capita food production in various areas now is less than it was before World War II? Nearly two-thirds of the world's people have inadequate food supplies. World food production has been lagging behind population growth. In Latin America, Africa, and the Far East, food production is growing only two-thirds as fast as population. In Latin America food production is below the levels of 25 years ago. In the last 5 years, the population of Latin America has increased almost twice as fast as food production. Medical science has brought about a sharp decrease in infant mortality in the less developed nations, and children under 15 years of age who are unable to add to production constitute 40 to 45 percent of the population, compared to 20 to 30 percent in the developed industrial countries.

Can we provide pure water supplies and drainage systems soon for hundreds of millions of these people? Can we supply means of transportation, communication, and power to many countries that are completely without such facilities? There is not sufficient available investment capital in the entire world to accomplish these objectives within a reasonably short time.

The per capita rate of growth of the national product in the less developed countries averaged 2.5 percent annually between 1950 to 1955. It declined to 1.9 percent over the next 5 years and is estimated at about 1 percent now. In recent years, the average income per person in the less developed nations increased by only \$1 a year. More than one-half of the persons in the entire world earn less than \$100 per person per year. The difference between the incomes of the peoples of the developed and the underdeveloped nations is widening at an increasing rate.

We must recognize that it is no easy task for governments in these nations in their present stage of development and with widespread illiteracy and poverty to follow middle-of-the-road policies that satisfy the radical elements, the military groups, the large landowners and businessmen. The leaders of many of these countries who are constantly facing crises feel impelled to speak the language of economic urgency and to adopt policies of expediency rather than wisdom. Governments will be considered politically inadequate if they are not economically responsive to need. As one considers the problems of the less developed nations, it seems inevitable that we shall face a turbulent and politically unstable world for years. Consequently, this is a time to be certain that we are sufficiently strong to maintain leadership in this kind of world. This is the time also to decide whether this Nation alone should attempt to assume responsibility for law and order everywhere. Can we ever be sufficiently powerful to maintain order wherever trouble may arise in the entire world? If not, what are the dimensions of our responsibility?

We have emphasized earlier the increasing role of business enterprise in this Nation. However, in varying degrees this is a worldwide development. In a world dedicated to improving the economic welfare of hundreds of millions of persons who are in poverty, business enterprise becomes a major center in a nation's life. The efficiency of production, the values of enlightened management, the widespread distribution of income to the masses, the opportunities given to individuals for economic progress, and a dedication to the primary objectives of a free competitive society all become of prime importance.

If widespread economic progress depends upon the organization of relatively large business enterprises, the world will adopt mass production, mass distribution, mass

communication, and mass education. Fortunately, these are ideas of the West, and especially the United States. Other nations may not accept our form of government. They may advocate centralized government with a minimum of freedom for the people. But they will be compelled to adopt the basic ideas of Western economic and business organization if they are to meet the desperate economic needs of their people. As they do, they may also find that these institutions flourish best in a free society where men have the opportunity and incentive to develop their talents.

These are some of the great issues which confront us. I trust I have not in these few minutes brought a false clarity to difficult issues. I am under no delusion that these are simple problems. But there is a time for the discussion and solution of great issues. There is a time for decision and action, or the relentless drift of events will make the decisions. These are issues for which the time for decision may now have arrived.

H.R. 10567 SHOULD BE DEFEATED

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THOMSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if the people living on rural routes throughout America want their good mail service to continue, they had better see to it that bill H.R. 10567 is defeated. This bill would authorize the Postmaster General to furnish rural carriers the vehicles needed for the delivery of mail.

The rural carriers throughout the United States travel each day in excess of 1,800,000 miles. There are 31,135 rural routes. If the Postmaster General elected to supply that number of vehicles, the paperwork in keeping track of them would be a monumental task. In addition, requests for repairs, the authorizations and the vouchers would pile up in Washington so deeply the postal service would be nothing but a paper-shuffling agency, rather than a mail delivery service.

Even worse would be the effects on the mail delivery service itself. Many rural carriers by necessity keep more than one vehicle so service may be uninterrupted. Many need special equipment for winter service, including 4-wheel drive. Many carriers live in small towns where emergency vehicles would not be available to them, and no motor pools could be established for prompt replacement due to motor failure or breakdown.

All of these problems are now met in an admirable manner by the loyal and hardworking rural mail carriers of America. They take pride in the regularity and efficiency of their service, and I know that they look with great apprehension at this proposal which would greatly cripple the efficiency of the service they now provide and would be more costly to the Government.

I will urge the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to make a very critical analysis, not only of the

costs of this measure, but the effects on the service. When all factors are reviewed, I have every confidence that this proposal will be abandoned even by its sponsors.

FREE WORLD TRADE WITH NORTH VIETNAM AND CUBA

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, perhaps nothing better demonstrates the lack of U.S. prestige than the fact that even our allies have not heeded our requests for an embargo on Communist North Vietnam and Cuba.

The record shows that, despite requests by the State Department, free world vessels continue to unload vital supplies in quantity in both North Vietnam and Cuban ports.

We are not only cooperating in the economic boycott of Rhodesia but are flying oil into next-door Zambia. Yet British-flag vessels unload the preponderance of free world oil and food reaching our North Vietnam and Cuban enemies.

British vessels carried almost 60 percent of 1965 shipments into North Vietnam ports—31 more British vessels entered Cuban ports since 1963 than those of the nearest free world competitor.

Yet we are, I repeat, assisting the British-led blockade against Rhodesia. This is tragic. American lives and American safety are at stake. The time has come to halt free world shipping to our Communist enemies—and we must do it.

COMMERCIAL JETS IN WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers yesterday carried the account of the decision of the Federal Aviation Agency opening Washington National Airport to short-range and intermediate commercial jet operations.

In my opinion, this is a most progressive step, even though some of the area politicians are expressing concern.

Most of the major commercial air carriers have announced that they are phasing-out their piston equipment, and by 1970, I imagine all commercial airlines will be flying jets exclusively.

As the ranking Republican on the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I have been working with the Administrator, General McKee, and the Federal Aviation Agency on

this particular subject since mid-September last year.

Although those persons interested in Friendship and Dulles International Airports express concern with this decision, I feel that General McKee and his Agency have made a sound decision based on public convenience and necessity. Attached to my remarks is the letter I received from General McKee on January 11, together with the press release by the Federal Aviation Agency on this subject:

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., January 11, 1966.

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DEVINE: In view of your interest, I would like you to know that I have just given approval to an agreement with the airlines for the operation of short-haul jets into Washington National Airport starting April 24, 1966. I am enclosing a copy of the announcement outlining the details.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. MCKEE,
Administrator.

FAA OPENS WASHINGTON NATIONAL TO SHORT-HAUL JET OPERATIONS

Washington National Airport will be opened to 2- and 3-engine short-haul jets on April 24, shortening the flight time between the Nation's Capital and certain major cities in the eastern half of the United States by a significant margin, the Federal Aviation Agency announced today.

The airport, which was opened on June 16, 1941, has never previously accepted scheduled air carrier jets. The lifting of this prohibition will assure Washington that the airport will remain a close-in air carrier airport as the airlines replace their propeller-driven planes with pure jets. Prior to the development of the smaller 2- and 3-engine jets, Washington National with its runways of 6,870, 5,202, and 4,724 feet could not handle 4-engine jets on a regular schedule. The introduction of such smaller jets as the Boeing 727, the Douglas DC-9, the BAC-111, and the Caravelle has altered the picture of air carrier service at Washington National since these newer, smaller airplanes can use the two longer runways regularly.

No consideration is being given to permitting the operation of big 4-engine jets from Washington National.

The FAA noted that the opening of jet service at Washington National does not change the basic roles of the two federally owned and operated airports serving the Washington area. Washington National will continue to serve the short- and medium-haul markets while Dulles International will still perform the function for which it was designed—the service of long-haul domestic and international markets.

Airlines have agreed to limit nonstop jet operations from Washington National to a radius of approximately 650 miles, except that this limit will be extended as far as 1,000 miles for scheduled service which was available from the airport in 1965. The jets will serve cities such as Miami, Memphis, St. Louis, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Minneapolis, New York, and Boston. Nonstop jets may also fly from Washington National to Montreal and Bermuda. The airlines will announce the dates when jet service to such cities will begin.

The two- and three-engine jets will cruise at approximately 550 miles per hour, nearly one-third faster than any propeller or turbo-prop aircraft.

The small and medium jets will climb out of the airport area more sharply and swiftly than propeller-driven aircraft, but otherwise they will use the same flight patterns

now in effect at Washington National. Although the noise created by jet engines is different from that of piston engines, jet engine noise levels at Washington National are expected to be about the same as is now created by the piston aircraft.

The FAA decision was made after months of study devoted to the probable impact on air passenger traffic in the Washington area if jet restrictions at Washington National were modified. The most reliable data available indicate that the use of Washington National by short- and medium-range jets will not prevent the continued growth of the other area airports, Dulles International and Friendship International.

With intermediate jet service, passenger traffic at Washington National is expected to rise from the current rate of 7 million persons per year to about 10 million within the next decade. Airlines are planning to enlarge their facilities at the airport, and the Federal Aviation Agency anticipates an eventual major modernization program for the terminal.

Traffic at Dulles International Airport is expected to rise from the 1965 total of 1 million passengers to about 2 million passengers a year by 1975. The airlines have agreed to maintain the daily schedule of flight service out of Dulles that was in effect on October 1, 1965, as a minimum—an average of 89 daily flights. Traffic at Friendship Airport, also is expected to increase significantly during the next 10 years.

The readjustment of landing fees at both Washington National and Dulles has been completed. The landing fees at both airports will be 32 cents per 1,000 pounds for jets. The Federal Aviation Agency estimates that net revenues from landing fees during the first year of jet operations will increase approximately \$550,000. During fiscal year 1965, landing fees at Washington National returned approximately \$1.1 million to the U.S. Treasury.

Although jet service at Washington National will not begin until April 24, when daylight saving time starts and the airlines revise their schedules, practice and familiarization flights with the two- and three-engine jets are now permissible.

IN SUPPORT OF A BILL TO RESTORE CUTS IN VETERANS' PENSIONS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, during the first session of this Congress, we enacted a measure to increase the social security benefits by 7 percent. I supported this proposal. Unfortunately this legislation caused many of our veterans and widows of veterans to have their veterans' retirement benefits reduced and in some instances terminated.

How did this happen? During the 88th Congress it was clear to most of us that because of increased living costs, something must be done to increase the benefits of those receiving social security. We recognized at that time that an increase in social security could result in many veterans and widows having their veterans' payments reduced. So we enacted legislation which provided that 10 percent of all payments to an individual, including social security,

would be exempt from the computation of income for veteran pensions.

Last year when we increased the social security benefits by 7 percent, the net result in many cases was to increase the veterans' annual income above the amount he was legally allowed to earn with the unintended result being that his veterans' benefits were reduced or terminated. One veteran told me that he received a \$4 increase in social security per month and suffered a \$25 reduction in his monthly veteran benefits. I am sure every Member of this body would want to see this situation corrected.

Therefore, I have introduced a bill today which permits a veteran to waive all or any part of annuity payments for purposes of increasing or determining eligibility for veterans' pensions. I believe every man ought to have a choice in this matter, and I hope Congress will act favorably this session to rectify this situation.

THOUGHT-PROVOKING EDITORIAL FROM THE WINFIELD, KANS., DAILY COURIER

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend to all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives a very thought-provoking editorial from the Winfield, Kans., Daily Courier. Its excellent message should be fair warning to all of us that we should stop, look, and reflect carefully before we enact legislation which further weakens the traditional legislative powers and adds to the catalog of strong executive powers.

For some time I have felt that Congress should begin exerting those responsibilities entrusted to it in the Constitution of the United States. It is no accident that Madison, Jefferson, and the Founding Fathers placed the powers of the legislative branch in the very first article of the Constitution. Their experience with a strong monarch and the limits they placed on the executive branch should be observed and respected, not ignored. This fine editorial does an excellent job of pointing out what is happening and what can happen if we are not more careful:

[From the Winfield, Kans., Daily Courier, Dec. 9, 1965]

NEW PRESSURES

Recent events in aluminum, steel, copper, shipping, the railways, and in the schools make it clear that in the past 20 years or so the White House indirectly has acquired a trunkful of strong powers.

These new powers were not directly provided to the President by the Constitution. They were not intentionally given to the President by Congress.

They are, rather, powers he has acquired as byproducts of dollars and contracting and allocation authority voted by Congress for entirely different purposes.

A President with imagination, widespread government know-how and determination can use these tools for a variety of objectives for which they were not intended. He can even deny he is using them for these other purposes.

He can impose his will on wide areas of the economy and for objectives that greatly affect our personal lives.

He can, for example, use new indirect powers to influence prices, profits, wages, hiring, managing and firing policies and what local city and county schools teach. He can decide that some firms will grow and others decline.

The multibillion-dollar stockpiles were set up so that the United States wouldn't be caught short of basic materials in a major war.

By selling or refusing to sell materials from the stockpiles a President can force prices down or up and thus regulate company profits.

The multibillion-dollar defense and space budgets were voted to keep the United States safely ahead of Communist Russia.

But a President can use this multi-billion-dollar-a-year contracting power to give or refuse contracts to major companies as a tool to force these firms or their unions into line.

By selecting areas where new contracts were let or new Government facilities built, a President could wipe out the prosperity of one community and create prosperity in another.

Antitrust laws were voted to prevent monopolies from harming the public and small businessmen.

But at some future date a President's underlings conceivably could threaten an antitrust investigation against a large firm which refused to cooperate in a Government program—say, a program to roll back prices. A firm could be threatened with a study of its tax returns.

Since, even for innocent firms, the cost of gathering evidence and conducting a defense might be very costly, the temptation to go along with a President could be overpowering.

Congress voted billions for education. A President can shut off sizable chunks of money to major school systems until those systems comply with administration rulings. These can go far beyond whether a school system integrates. Through national testing requirements, Federal rules on teaching and teachers can be indirectly applied to schools receiving Federal money.

If the Federal Bureau of Investigation should ever be headed by a man less honest and courageous than J. Edgar Hoover, the files of that organization could be a strong weapon in the hands of a President who wanted to convince individuals to follow his suggestions.—R.C.

ACTION SHOULD BE TAKEN TO HALT IMMEDIATELY ALL FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM AND CUBAN PORTS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, on New Year's Eve, I telegraphed the President and asked that action be taken to halt immediately all free world shipping to North Vietnam and Cuban ports.

I pointed out that our cooperation in the embargo on Rhodesia in Africa gives us the tool to persuade our allies to take this step.

My telegram read as follows:

According to press and news media we are participating in enforcing oil and vital materials embargo against Rhodesia. May I urgently recommend that we now insist on reciprocity by British and all the free world governments in enforcing embargo upon Communist North Vietnam and Cuba? British and other free world ships continue to land oil and other vital supplies in quantity in North Vietnam thus strengthening the very enemies with which we are now at war. Maritime Administration reported in early December 1965 that 83 British, 52 Lebanese, and other free world ships have landed oil, wheat, and so forth, in Cuban ports while ignoring our embargo requests and thus increasing threat of communism in the Americas. Now is the time for firm, decisive action on this matter by the United States.

I received an acknowledgment from the White House and was assured my views would be given consideration. I feel that not a moment should be lost in enforcing an embargo on our two active Communist enemies. So far 11 days have gone by without, so far as I am aware, any action being taken.

The entire situation was forcefully summarized by Columnist Arthur Kroch in the New York Times of December 5, 1965, who said:

Ships of our allies are regularly delivering cargoes essential to the North Vietnamese economy; and, except for South Korea, the Asiatic nations have no troops on the bloody battlefield.

FREE WORLD SHIPPING INTO NORTH VIETNAM AND CUBAN PORTS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, how inept in diplomacy can we get?

Here we are busy halting oil, sugar, and other shipments into Rhodesia. Yet our present diplomats cannot get our friends to stop shipping vital supplies to our active enemies. We know the State Department has tried but apparently not very hard and certainly not with effect.

British ships, Lebanese ships, Scandinavian ships, and other free world ships continue to carry oil and food to North Vietnam and to Cuba. The Communists fighting us from North Vietnam and endangering us from Cuba are thus strengthened.

It does not seem to me it would take undue skill for our diplomats to say: "If we are helping you, why you don't help us?" Or even, "If you won't help us, we won't help you."

After all, this is not a pink tea. This is not table tennis. Free world shipments to North Vietnam and Cuba endanger the flower of our manhood in

one case and our security as a nation in the other.

If the administration's diplomats cannot get an embargo on free world shipping to North Vietnam and Cuba, I suggest we fire them and get some diplomats who can.

COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, a vital piece of unfinished business confronts us as we begin the 2d session of the 89th Congress and demands the earliest possible consideration. I speak of the proposal commonly known as the cold war GI bill. It is well known that this session of Congress will be preoccupied with the war in Vietnam. Certainly our concern for the many aspects of this situation would be unforgivably incomplete if we failed to seek just and equitable treatment for our fighting men defending the cause of freedom in that remote area of the world. Casualty figures alone do not tell us the full extent of the sacrifices being made by our men in uniform. Without doubt the American GI in Vietnam is making a contribution to his country at the cost of a personal sacrifice no less great than that made by his older brother in the Korean conflict or his father in World War II. We should make certain that the Vietnam veteran is accorded the same rights and privileges that we have granted in the recent past.

No doubt we will have to decide this session what Federal programs are most deserving of tax money already hard pressed by the requirements of the Vietnam war. Clearly this would not seem to be the time to initiate new programs. But even though the cold war GI bill is a new program it should be equally clear that at a time when our draft calls are on the increase and our military services are being bolstered to meet our growing commitments in South Vietnam that this is no time to slight those people directly responsible for carrying out this country's difficult and demanding job of stopping Communist aggression and subversion. I believe the American people demand that we take proper care of our veterans and that they further believe certain domestic programs, regardless of their peacetime merit should give way where necessary.

I am indeed encouraged by the announced intention of the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee to hold early hearings on this bill and feel certain that an equitable program can be agreed upon in the very near future. A Congress would not be well remembered by history that failed the Nation's veterans. They are not failing their country.

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue which has the broad support of the American people as is indicated by an editorial which appeared in the December 27, 1965, edition of the State Journal, Lansing, Mich., entitled "Troops in Vietnam Merit GI Benefits." Its logic is clear, its argument simple and direct, and I commend it to my colleagues. Under unanimous consent I will insert it in the RECORD following these remarks.

A GI education program will require added appropriations but its cost should be considered an integral part of the cost of the war in Vietnam. It is not a fringe benefit. It is essential to insuring that the disruption experienced by these young men will not necessarily work a continuing hardship on them as they seek to realize their life plans and goals.

The editorial follows:

TROOPS IN VIETNAM MERIT GI BENEFITS

Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE, Democrat, of Texas, the father of the GI bill of rights for Korean war veterans, predicts early approval of a new bill which would provide similar benefits for American fighting men in Vietnam.

The prediction should be borne out by Congress when it gets down to business next year.

TEAGUE said recently he expected Congress to pass, by the end of February, legislation extending education and home-buying benefits to veterans with more than 180 days of active duty since 1955. Such a bill already has been approved by the Senate.

In simple justice to those who are fighting in Vietnam for the same principles U.S. troops fought to uphold in Korea, we share Representative TEAGUE's hope that the Johnson administration will retreat from its opposition to the measure when the House Veterans' Affairs Committee resumes hearings on the bill next month.

Previous bills have helped millions of veterans, including those who fought in World War II, go to college and buy homes. Similarly, the new bill would pay college or vocational school expenses and guarantee loans for purchase of homes, farms, and farm equipment for veterans of more than 180 days' active service since the Korean GI bill expired January 31, 1965.

Commenting on administration opposition to the bill, TEAGUE said: "Money is the whole thing." He estimated the cost would be several hundred million dollars in the first year.

Congress this year passed costly Great Society legislation at the bidding of the same administration that up to this point has opposed granting to GI's fighting in Vietnam benefits similar to those made available to the veterans of World War II and Korea.

Conserving the taxpayers' money is an important objective—a point which hasn't bothered Johnson when he has pushed through Congress other spending programs he has deemed in the Nation's interest.

The public should not be required to pay for frills as well as the increasing cost of the war in Vietnam and other essential spending but fairness and justice to the U.S. forces in Vietnam certainly should not be regarded as a frill.

The bill already passed by the Senate was also sponsored by a Texas Democratic lawmaker, RALPH W. YARBOROUGH.

Legislation that would extend the GI benefits to veterans of the Vietnam conflict deserves the support of another prominent Texas Democrat—President Johnson.

But whether Johnson supports it or not, Congress has an obligation to enact it at next year's session.

THEY'D HAVE TO SEE IT TO BELIEVE IT

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, too often here in Washington, the elected and appointed officials forget who they really work for.

Appearances of the last session of this body to the contrary, we do not work for the President or for a powerful lobby. We work for the people of the United States of America and it is to them that we owe an accounting for our daily efforts.

And yet only one day of the year do we even allow them into our workshop. And then it is not to see us work, but to listen with us. Tonight the President will come to the House to deliver the state of the Union address to Congress, giving the American public the rare chance to view the interior of this Chamber.

But then they will only have the opportunity to hear the Chief Executive give them his one-sided version of what his Great Society administration has done and what it intends to do.

Then the heavy doors behind us will shut for another year on the television cameras that could and should be reporting our actions into the homes of the people those actions affect.

It is of utmost importance that the Nation see Congress in action with its own eyes.

Last year bills were rammed and railroaded through the House under intense White House pressure. In many cases there was inadequate debate.

Major legislation passed without any amendments permitted except those approved by the White House. Many of these amendments would have improved the legislation.

In other cases, amendments were offered, and no debate upon them was permitted. In short, there were times last year when the legislative process was a mockery under the heavy hand of the White House.

Had the American people been able to see this House the evening that the highway beautification bill was rolled over repeated pleas for an open debate and finally rubberstamped sometime after midnight, they would view their legislative process with grave concern.

Perhaps if they could have sat here at other times and seen the effects of the administration hatchetmen on our deliberations, they would ponder about the balance of power they read about in school.

If they could have heard amendment after amendment to the bill repealing section 14(b) shouted down before they were even heard, they would have wondered if there were any freedom of speech left here.

Just a few glances of some of the mock deliberations of last year would have given them some serious doubts about this consensus they hear so much about.

But the truth is an elusive thing, and these strong-arm tactics must be seen to be believed.

I have introduced today, legislation to make sure that the American people will be able to see the performance of their democracy in action. The bill would let the television cameras stay in this Chamber after the President leaves tonight and allow them to continue reporting to America just what we do and how we do it.

I believe if the American people see this happening with their own eyes, they will demand that this lick-and-promise lawmaking end at once. They will insist on Congress doing a thorough and a fair job of legislating. The searching and all-seeing eye of the TV camera will do a good deal in straightening out and strengthening the legislative branch of Government.

My colleagues of the minority and I seek to bring to the American people the truth instead of the hodgepodge of consensus-culled information distorted by the bureaucracy's public relations departments.

CLEVELAND URGES CONGRESSIONAL BROADCASTING BILL STRESSES PEOPLES' RIGHT TO LOOK AND LISTEN

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, today, in company with nine other Members, I am introducing legislation by which it would be possible for public sessions of the House and House committees to be broadcast live by radio and television.

This legislation carries the endorsement of the Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform and Minority Staffing, of which I am chairman, but it is not really a partisan proposal. I hope it will win significant support from our Democratic colleagues who are likewise concerned to keep the public as well informed about the legislative branch as they are about the executive branch, which so dominates the airways.

The development of electronics media has revolutionized the country. It is changing the conduct of government, political campaigning, education, advertising, and journalism. A picture is, indeed, worth a thousand words. This legislation would bring the House of Representatives—the peoples' forum—into the electronic age, at least so far as communications is concerned.

PRESIDENTIAL DOMINATION OF AIRWAYS

It is about time. For some years, our Presidents have recognized the impor-

ance of television. Through the power and prestige of their office, they are able to dominate this media to present their particular viewpoints to the people under the best possible conditions. Tonight, for instance, President Johnson is coming to deliver his state of the Union message. He has chosen his time with careful deliberation—it is the prime viewing time across the Nation. Indeed, until the advent of television, Presidents delivered these addresses at noontime. The effect is that the message is addressed directly more to the people of the country than it is to their elected representatives. There is a subtle but profound constitutional change in this. It is a change which elevates the position of the executive branch at the expense of the legislative branch, although the two are created coequal by the Constitution.

When the President departs, the cameras and the microphones will depart with him. Under our present rules, the doors of the House will remain shut to them throughout the important debates of this very important session, unless, of course, the President chooses to come again in this way to address us.

LIVE BROADCASTS WOULD STRENGTHEN DEMOCRACY

In my opinion, this is wrong. In the interests of elemental democracy as well as the interests of the Congress itself, radio and television should be permitted, under certain limitations prescribed in these bills, to bring the public to the floor. They should be able to see and hear the great debates which will decide their futures. The public should have a chance to hear the minority arguments.

I believe further that one of the best ways to win public support for some of the much-needed reforms of congressional procedures would be for the public to see and hear how some of their business is conducted.

PUBLIC RIGHT TO KNOW

I sometimes refer to this legislation as look and listen bills. The public has a right to look and listen and this legislation would allow the people to come into their Congress. It would help to offset the overconcentration on the President and his points of view and it would help to redress the present imbalance between the two branches of government.

This legislation is a vital, first step in modernizing the Congress, and I strongly urge its prompt consideration by the House.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN VIETNAM?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege, following the adjournment of Congress, to make a study tour of Vietnam and other parts of Asia. I made this trip at my own expense in

order that I could report to my constituents, the situation in Vietnam from first-hand observation. I know that many of my colleagues went to Vietnam and shared in much of the information I was able to gather and I am sure many of them will report their findings to the House from time to time, as I intend to do.

At this point I would like to point out the most disturbing element of this very confusing war situation. That is the support the Communist enemy, the Vietcong, is receiving from our allies. Ships of many nations from the free world are steaming daily into the harbor at Haiphong, unloading goods and materials for the North Vietnamese which enable them to carry on the war in which American boys are dying in the cause of freedom for all people. I have called repeatedly, as many of you have, for a blockade of the harbor at Haiphong.

A situation which has not been publicized, and which is even more shameful than the free use of the harbor at Haiphong by our allies, is the shipping of goods through the Mekong River, through South Vietnam into Cambodia. The South Vietnamese are powerless to prevent these shipments because the Mekong River is considered an international waterway. In the past year, while American men have been fighting to the death to halt the Communist aggression against South Vietnam, more than 250 ships of our allied nations have sailed up the Mekong River and unloaded supplies in Cambodia near the very heart of the area where these supplies are needed by the Vietcong to wage their war against a free people.

Now, listen to this startling fact, about the same number of free nation ships have been going into Haiphong harbor and the combined total of allied shipments to Haiphong and through the Mekong River add up to more than the total goods and materials shipped to the North Vietnamese by Communist nations. Surely we in Congress and the American people have the right to ask the President, what goes on in Vietnam?

Mr. Speaker, is there a Member of this Congress who can give a reasonable explanation to his constituents and to the mothers, fathers, wives, and children of the men who have died at the hands of the Vietcong for such support of our enemy by nations which are supposed to be our friends?

Why does the President keep these facts from the American people? Is it because he puts less trust in his own people than he does in the hope that the Communists do not really mean what they say when they threaten to bury us and rule the world?

I am firmly convinced that the first order of business of this session of Congress should be to demand a frank report from the President concerning his intentions in Vietnam. The very least the American people should expect is that he take whatever action is necessary to cut the supply lines to North Vietnam, especially those supply lines being used by nations who freely accept our aid and

support, but continue to send in goods to strengthen our enemy and theirs. We cannot continue to fight for the freedom of the world unless the rest of the world is willing to contribute something to the protection of freedom. Not another day should go by without serving notice on the world that no further shipments are going to be permitted through Haiphong Harbor or up the Mekong River.

PEOPLE WORRIED ABOUT U.S. ROLE AS WORLD POLICEMAN

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week two of my colleagues, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] joined me in sending a letter to the President, in which we reported public concern about the U.S. role as world policeman. As it dealt with the Vietnam war and the need for a better union of free-nation effort in world affairs, I am placing the text in the RECORD:

JANUARY 7, 1966.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We hope your state of the Union message will include recommendations for a more perfect union of the free nations. This would lift the spirits of the American people. It would give them hope that in the future we will no longer be virtually alone in "guarding the gates of freedom," as is the case today in Vietnam.

The American people are disappointed and distressed because our major allies are not sharing the military burdens we have assumed in southeast Asia. They are also worried about what lies ahead if the United States attempts to police the world by itself.

Your message presents a splendid opportunity for you to announce steps which hopefully will lead to effective free-world teamwork in dealing with worldwide trouble spots like Vietnam.

The atmosphere will change from gloom to promise if you will state U.S. willingness and desire from this day forward to follow policies that are developed jointly with our allies. If we are ever to achieve cooperative action, we must accept cooperative policymaking. We must treat our allies as responsible and trustworthy partners.

Policy on all critical problems which have worldwide importance should be developed automatically within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Had we developed policy with our allies in the early days of the Vietnam struggle we could reasonably expect their full cooperation today.

We must set goals worthy of the tremendous sacrifices now being made in Vietnam. Long-range objectives of the free-world community must be defined. Free-world institutions—presently weak and in confusing array—must be brought together and strengthened. Resolutions to these ends will be before the new session of Congress, and your encouragement will be most helpful and gratifying.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY.

ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH.

ALBERT H. QUIE.

TRIBUTE GIVEN TO DR. R. F. TROIANO

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, last October more than 400 of the leading citizens of Yonkers, N.Y., paid tribute at a Columbus Day dinner to Dr. R. F. Troiano for his years of dedicated service to the community—New York State's fifth largest city.

On that occasion, Dr. Troiano had a most important message, not only for the city of Yonkers, but for our entire Nation. He proposed a fund for America—a fund not of dollars, but of citizenship.

I was proud to join the many community leaders in Yonkers in honoring Dr. Troiano and I was deeply impressed by his message. In the hope that people all over the United States will read and take this message to heart, I offer, for inclusion in the RECORD, an article and an editorial which appeared in the Yonkers, N.Y., Herald Statesman following Dr. Troiano's tribute:

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald Statesman, Oct. 13, 1965]

GOOD CITIZEN OFFERS YONKERS A NEW FUND

A physician who was singled out for Columbus Day honors has offered his community a different kind of fund: a pledge of good citizenship.

The proposal came at a Columbus Day dinner in the Polish Community Center at which 400 community leaders saluted Dr. R. F. Troiano for outstanding service to Yonkers. Here's what he had to say:

"I have often been asked why I participate in any community services. The answer comes from a deep personal conviction that whatever service an individual renders his local government, he in turn renders a service to his country. And right now in these critical hours our country needs the fullest measure of your civic abilities and capabilities.

"What with so much lawlessness, crime, and terror, so much public apathy and self-indulgence, civic, moral, and family irresponsibility, and so much hatred and loss of faith in God, and with so much loss of patriotism and with so many factions and factors bent on the destruction of America, it behooves us all to dig deeply into the roots of our national heritage and reaffirm the great principles of God and country.

"As you know, there are funds for all things and funds for all causes. As we celebrate the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus, I would like to propose a Fund for America, a fund wherein the contribution is not in terms of dollars and cents, but of one's self in the pledge of good citizenship.

"A citizenship that is pledged to hard work, self-improvement, fair play, and full of the spirit and zeal that made America great.

"A citizenship that is pledged to civic, moral, and family responsibility.

"A citizenship that is devoid of racial hatred and racial prejudice and is dedicated to the premise 'that all men are created free and equal with liberty and justice for all'.

"A citizenship that pledges allegiance and swears loyalty to these United States of America and offers duty with honor.

"A citizenship that offers prayer and devotion to God, and states loudly and clearly, 'In God we trust.'"

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald Statesman, Oct. 15, 1965]

DR. TROIANO RALLIES ALL YONKERS TO A PLEDGE OF CIVIC SERVICE

General Eisenhower, on the occasion of his 75th birthday anniversary, made some welcome homely references to simple patriotism.

He expressed regret that—for some inexplicable reason—we seem to have downgraded an emotion so basically beautifully, and importantly American.

Readers must have been extraimpressed to hear ex-President Ike's sentiments, if they had just finished enjoying the Columbus Day speech of Dr. R. F. Troiano, which we proudly published in yesterday's Herald Statesman under the headline, "Good Citizen Offers Yonkers a New Fund."

In home after home, we feel sure, Dr. Troiano's meaty remarks were not only read but probably reread aloud to other members of the family.

In one such household, as the reading concluded, the mother exclaimed, "You can say that again."

We echo the same sentiment. Indeed we will "say that again," for Dr. Troiano's words deserve clipping and saving, and frequent reread—aloud, for whole families.

"I would like to propose a fund for America," said the physician, "a fund wherein the contribution is not in terms of dollars and cents but of one's self—in the pledge of good citizenship.

"A citizenship that is pledged to hard work, self-improvement, fairplay and full of the spirit and zeal that made America great. A citizenship that is pledged to civic, moral, and family responsibility.

"A citizenship that is devoid of racial hatred and racial prejudice and is dedicated to the premise that 'all men are created free and equal with liberty and justice for all'.

"A citizenship that pledges allegiance and swears loyalty to the United States of America and offers duty with honor.

"A citizenship that offers prayer and devotion to God, and states loudly and clearly: 'In God we trust.'"

Now, then, doesn't that put us all back into the channels of solid American thinking that were established in 1776? Aren't those words the very warp and woof of the good American life, envied around the globe?

Thank you very much, Dr. Troiano.

BILL PROVIDING CANCELLATION OF ANY DISTRIBUTIVE FRANCHISE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill providing that upon the cancellation of any distributive franchise, the terminated franchise holder shall have the right to recover damages and the cost of any necessary legal action arising from the failure of the franchisor to act in good faith in complying with the terms and provisions of the franchise agreement.

At the present time, the so-called Automobile Dealers Day in Court Act

which was passed in 1956, gives this protection to automobile dealers. In a sense it is class legislation. Do not misunderstand me. I am pleased that our automobile dealers have this very valuable protection. I simply want to extend it so that all franchise holders may have the same benefits regardless of the commodity which they market.

Mr. Speaker, this is a most crucial matter. The franchise method of distribution is one of the most rapidly growing marketing systems in our economy.

Typically, there is great disparity of size and, consequently, of market power between the franchisor and the franchisee. The holder of the franchise is most often a small businessman who has chosen this method of distribution in order to become an independent businessman. The supplier—the grantor of the franchise—is typically a medium sized or a large corporation. All too frequently the franchise holder has either an informal verbal agreement with his supplier or a written franchise agreement that has been verbally modified from time to time in various respects.

The franchised distributor plays a most important role for his supplier. It may be said that he carries his supplier's economic banner into battle. Through service and salesmanship, he builds up consumer demand for the supplier's product in the local marketplace. This, obviously, adds value to the trademark or brand name of the supplier. It is equally obvious that it is patently unfair for the franchise to be able to cancel the franchise of his local distributor unless he has acted in full good faith and has complied with the terms and provisions of the agreement and has compensated the dealer for any sums to which he is entitled.

This is the purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker; to insure that all franchise holders are treated fairly and equally by their suppliers. It is my hope that the committee to which this bill is referred will hold hearings promptly on this measure and that when it comes to the floor of the House, each of the Members of Congress will give serious considerations to its provisions.

DONALD W. DOUGLAS RECEIVED CALIFORNIA MANUFACTURER OF THE YEAR AWARD, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding Californian and a great American has recently been singled out for a well-deserved recognition. We speak of one of the airframe industry's giants and leaders, Donald W. Douglas. This past year he was named "California Manufacturer of the Year" and on January 21 this year he will receive the annual Tony Jannus Award from the Greater

Tampa Chamber of Commerce for his outstanding contributions in aviation.

Over 40 years ago, Donald Douglas commenced his fruitful, rewarding career in aviation in a small building in Santa Ana, Calif., a city in my 34th Congressional District. In this first venture he joined another of the great giants of aviation, Glenn L. Martin. In 1961 Donald Douglas, still moving on the frontier of developments in air space vehicles, came back to Orange County and to the 34th Congressional District by choosing this area for his great new plant which builds space vehicles such as the Saturn IV. In this facility the Douglas organization will also be doing much of its research and development for space science.

It is, therefore, a singular privilege for me to bring to the attention of this House and the American people, the great career of a man whose experience spans the entire history of aviation and to ask that all of you join me in saluting this man, his career, and his contribution to the building of an industry, for making his country a leader in a new science.

I include herein the remarks of Gov. Edmund G. Brown upon the occasion of extending the "California Manufacturer of the Year Award" to Mr. Douglas on November 19, 1965:

REMARKS BY GOV. EDMUND G. BROWN, "CALIFORNIA MANUFACTURER OF THE YEAR AWARD," 1965, LOS ANGELES, NOVEMBER 19, 1965

It is a tremendous pleasure to join you today in paying tribute to a great Californian—Donald W. Douglas.

Mr. Douglas' career spans the entire history of aviation in this country; he was consultant to the Connecticut Aircraft Co. in 1915 and chief engineer for the Glenn L. Martin Co. that same year. He served as chief civilian aeronautical engineer for the U.S. Signal Corps during World War I; he designed the first Martin bomber; and then in 1920, he moved his family to California to start his own airplane manufacturing venture.

Donald Douglas really symbolizes the kind of Californian who has come here as a pioneer and stayed to contribute to our State's growth and greatness. He was not yet 30 and his assets added up to only \$600 when he came here. But he soon had designed and built the "Cloudster," of which we have the model here today. Since that time, his achievements in aviation read like an encyclopedia of the history of American aviation. The B-19 during World War II; the DC-4 transports; the DC-6; a whole series of great airplanes, culminating with the DC-9, which was flown this year and will go into airline service in 1966.

Donald Douglas' leadership has also extended to the Douglas Thor, which has been the first stage in launch vehicles for such satellites as Explorer I, Pioneer V, the Discoverer series and many more. It has also been part of the development of the orbiting solar observatory, Telstar, and the world's first international satellite, the S-51.

As Governor of this great State, let me tell you that I am glad, for the sake of all of us, that Donald Douglas decided to come here back in 1920, with that \$600 in his pocket.

It is men of such vision and courage who have built this State in the past and are building California today.

It is men of this high caliber who account for California's leadership; for the fact that we lead all States in prime military contracts, with 22.1 percent; and in prime contracts

awarded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—47.6 percent.

Four California industries—electrical equipment, ordnance, aircraft, and instruments—employed an average of 483,900 workers in California last year. They accounted for 35 percent of all manufacturing employment in the State—far higher ratio than in any other in the Nation.

California accounts today for nearly one-fourth of all the increase in employment in the United States since 1950, and for 31 percent of the increase in manufacturing. It has been predicted that we will lead the Nation in manufacturing by 1970.

Aerospace and the California State government are closely linked—more closely here than anywhere else. This year the industry accepted our invitation to apply its sophisticated knowledge to earthbound problems—transportation, information, waste management, and crime. They have given us magnificent reports and we are going to benefit from them in the near future. Mayor-elect John Lindsay has already decided to follow our lead in New York.

Donald Douglas, as Governor I want to express the appreciation of your fellow Californians. There are almost 19 million of them. By 1970, there will be more than 21 million—and we will still be America's best, richest, most vital, and thriving market. You have done much to bring us to that position. We salute you for your 50 years as a great American, and expect many more achievements from you in the future.

STRIVING TO MULTIPLY BREAD

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the world in general, with the leadership of the United States in particular, has right now the potential to feed 10 times the present population of the earth or 30 billion people.

Such a statement, by many, will be branded as extravagant. Even as winter now comes the grim prospect is for a rising tide of hunger. In all underdeveloped countries grave concern is constantly expressed over a growing population which exceeds the available food supply. Yet we maintain that the contention there is not enough food for the growing masses of people is false. It is predicated on the presence of unnecessary and undesirable restraints on production, processing, and distribution. It rests on inefficient methods of providing protein; it exists because of unjustifiable waste, spoilage, and deterioration.

We have, in the United States, developed the greatest agri-business combination in the world's history. It must now be restricted in its output by artificial farm policy. Wedded to this giant we have in the food industry of America a tremendous team of processors, packagers, distributors, and retailers. These, working together, have produced a confusion of food variety and an embarrassment of food abundance. We challenge the world, therefore, to call on the full strength of this existing combination. The truth is that not only does this exist—

ing team work now at half power, but the food technologists who stand behind this team have a scientific potential for building a bigger pot pie or a larger bowl of rice, or whatever is required by the table of man. Bring the full force of our scientific advances to bear on the food shortage and all must see at once the positive proof of our original proposition. We can feed 30 billion people.

Two-thirds of the world, or 2 billion people, are chronically undernourished, lacking both in quantity and quality of food. This hunger means death for some, poor health, and physical weakness for many, and lack of vigor and intelligent response for all. Virtually two-thirds of the earth's inhabitants are operating at a sublevel of potential because of lack of protein. Protein malnutrition is primarily due to an inadequate consumption of animal protein. The world's deficit in this valuable food item today is estimated at 40 billion pounds. At the same time there exists in the untapped resources of the sea a sufficient yield of protein to feed 30 billion people a year, 10 times the world's present population. In addition to this we lose, through inefficiency, spoilage, and waste, one-half, or more, of our present large protein production, that is why we believe that all too many people in this world are starving in the midst of abundance. Within a 10-year span we could easily supply a protein sufficient diet for 12 to 15 times the present world's population—estimated at 3 billion. We face frustration in feeding the world's multitudes simply from a lack of political motivation to bring to bear on the problem of food shortage the resources and the knowledge readily at hand. The irony is that food technology now holds out, to a yet ignoring world, ready answers for this problem. There are three fronts in particular where food technology now stands on the frontier of a fantastic new developments which can produce protein foods high in quality, low in price, and easily distributed. We will discuss these three food frontiers in the following sections:

PASTEURIZATION OF FOOD PRODUCTS

One of the grave limiting factors faced in the distribution of foodstuffs arise from deterioration and decay. There are two new emerging treatment methods by which deterioration can be stopped and decay substantially delayed. The first of these new methods arises from the scientific application of atomic energy. Some time ago it was discovered that treatment by radiation rays of certain active elements would lengthen the shelf life or storage and distribution life of foods. These experiments started some years ago and are now at a stage for dramatic application for food processing. This procedure will have dynamic and far-reaching effects in many lands. A paper published by the Department of the Interior in October 1965 demonstrates this fact.

Louis J. Ronsivalte and J. W. Slavin, working at the Technological Laboratory, U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, reported that fresh, frozen, or refrigerated fish, treated by low doses of gamma rays from a cobalt 60 source, in-

creased storage life 1 month. The report states:

The value of fishery products as a source of protein is well known and since man's dependence on them is anticipated to increase it is inevitable that he apply his latest technology to the sea. In general fishery products are relatively perishable and consequently distribution of fresh fish and shellfish is limited to coastal areas. Wider distribution is possible.

The report then goes on to show how fresh fish treated by the gamma rays reduced by 99 percent the deteriorating bacteria which causes decay, and in this sterilized condition such fish could maintain their fresh state over a sustained period without measurable loss of flavor or food quality.

Such a discovery applied to a country like Peru could have a phenomenal effect. The coast of that country is rich and abundant in fish life, yet the Indians of the interior, located just a few miles from the coast, are suffering from serious protein deficiency. Cheap fish products in great quantities could be made available inland if a treatment plant was installed in one or more of the port cities of Peru. This would be true, also, in India and Africa where great untapped fisheries are available for exploitation. Further studies and research carried out by and between our Government and our great food industry can, and should, widen to the greatest extent the varieties of fish and foodstuff which respond well to this radiation pasteurization. Government research should establish maximum storage times; test and select most efficient packaging and conduct economic feasibility studies for broadening the market of foods thus treated.

Another promising approach to food pasteurization and sterilization lies in recent experiments being conducted with high frequency waves varying from the ultrasonic to the X-ray. Such electronic treatments have destroyed insect life in tropical fruits. These pests destroy countless tons of otherwise consumable fresh food product. There is, in other experiments, the unfolding possibility of other stages of pasteurization and sterilization against destructive organic bodies and bacterial growth. These advances are not as well published and, perhaps, not as fully developed as the irradiation processes. They are, however, another of the emerging methods to increase the effective life of food products and thus widen the time range of distribution and storage of food.

PROTEIN CONCENTRATES

Another technological breakthrough is occurring in the development of protein concentrates. The experiments in this technology have been occurring in both cereal grains and in fish products. These developments not only show us new source for protein but also indicate increases by a factor of substantial proportions in our efficiency in producing concentrated protein. The present food chain process for concentrating protein is to feed fish and cereal products to chicken, swine, and beef to produce animal protein. Animal meat building processes concentrate the proteins of vegetables, fish, grasses, and cereal

grains. This is a very inefficient method of concentrating protein as these are all warm-blooded creatures and they burn more protein in keeping warm than they store in the live tissue which builds meat. Let us see how this works in fish. Quoting from a recent memorandum done by W. M. Chapman, of the Van Camp Sea Food Co., the story is told as follows:

The discovery of the nutritional benefits of a 2- to 7-percent fishmeal addition to the diet of chicken, swine, and cattle in making them grow and produce better has led to a most enormous growth of world fisheries for the kind of fish that did not accommodate themselves well or cheaply to generally direct human food. Taking out most of the oil and most of the water resulted in a nutritionally beneficial product with good stability.

The use of fish for this purpose on a worldwide basis has risen from about 590 metric tons of meal in 1948 to 3,500,000 tons in 1964. Converted to round weight of fish, this means an increase in use from about 3.4 million tons of raw fish for this purpose in 1948, to about 20 million tons—approximately 40 percent of all of the fish caught in all of the world—in 1964.

Why should chicken, swine, and cattle in the United States eat better than two-thirds of the world population? An obviously desirable objective is to skip the chicken, pig, or cattle step, where much protein is burned up to keep the animal warm, and produce a defatted, dehydrated, stable fish protein concentrate under hygienic conditions suitable for human consumption. The Congress has provided the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries with funds to tackle the technological problem of doing this and the research is not only promising but already is being carried out on a pilot plant scale. This new processing technology could have a revolutionary effect on the domestic fisheries. Its advocates and proponents claim it will. Viobin Corp. of Massachusetts is already a major private producer of fish powder which when ultimately refined is an odorless, tasteless white powder compound. The president of the Viobin Corp. had this to say:

A new food has been created made from the fish of the sea. The new food is as nutritious as milk or meat and will cost one-third to one-fifth the cost of milk. The new food can be made anywhere in the world; it does not spoil; does not change; keeps indefinitely until used. The new food can wipe out chronic protein starvation plaguing 2 out of 3 people on earth. The new food can solve the problem of the world's terrifying exploding population.

The powder can be made of many varieties of fish, including many of the so-called scrap fish. Four or five hundred-pound sacks of this powder would deliver more concentrated protein than a full cattle boat loaded with beef—and without the losses from heat generation, the losses of time, the losses of expense in raising and handling the cattle. The shipping weight and the ultimate handling weight of the end product are greatly reduced.

The powder can be added to any indigenous staple such as rice, beans, or corn flour and thus the problem of acceptance in the variety of food cultures

around the world is quickly overcome. One teaspoon of the powder concentrate provides all the protein required for 1 day.

At the same time, protein concentrates from cereal are also being developed that have all of the advantages claimed for fish protein concentrates. The most successful practical breakthrough has come in Guatemala in Central America. There, an institute of nutrition, called INCAP, originally founded by the Kellogg Foundation and now funded by all the Central American countries, has produced a product called "Incaparina." After a series of experiments, starting in 1950, a vegetable mixture designated No. 9B was derived. It consists of 29 percent ground maize, 29 percent ground sorghum, 38 percent cottonseed flour, 3 percent tortilla yeast, and 1 percent calcium carbonate with vitamin A added. The generic name mentioned above, "Incaparina," was given to this mixture. In 1962 a report on this product states as follows:

Numerous laboratory trials of Incaparina have clearly proved that its protein, quantitatively and qualitatively, closely approaches that of milk, a food in short supply and expensive to buy in Central America. Incaparina is easy to prepare and when cooked, sweetened and flavored, closely resembles the "atole" so savored by a majority in this area.

Incaparina is now licensed for production in Central America to Quaker Oats Corp. and it produces, when mixed with water, a fluid equal or superior to milk for less than 1 cent a glass. It is used widely in school food programs and is available for purchase in most stores in Central America. The United States should turn its technological know-how immediately to similar protein concentrates, using excess and spoiling grains. This flour product, like the fish flour previously discussed, has a long storage life and is easily transported with little likelihood of loss from spoilage. Think of the vast good our surplus cereals could do if used in this way.

Purdue University recently developed a new hybrid corn high in protein. Plant pathologists have long realized that normal corn is low in amino acid content, the essential ingredient of protein. What the botanists and plant specialists in Lafayette, Ill., have done is to breed in to the corn this absence of amino acid. Such a new corn will be important to animal feeders but more highly significant in those lands in Latin America and Africa where corn is the principal staple in the diet.

The most interesting and dramatic development for protein concentrate is in the pure chemical approach. Announced from Holland not long ago has been the isolation of a natural protein called lysine. Lysine has been derived from coal, a heat energy source gradually losing the battle to electrical and atomic power. The Dutch claim they could revolutionize the world's food problem with the new process.

Lysine is an odorless, white powder with a slightly salty taste. It is the most important of the 18 amino acids necessary for building body protein in man and animals. A Dutch spokesman

states that since animal foods such as meat, eggs, and dairy products are in such short supply, especially in emerging countries, lysine could be the immediate and ready answer. It can be made in unlimited quantities and at an attractive price, the spokesman said. Large-scale production is predicted in the very near future.

FREEZE-DRY FOOD PROCESSING

The third and final new frontier in food technology is the freeze-dry method. In this process the food product is first frozen then all the water is extracted under very critical vacuum conditions. The product resulting, when packaged to prevent penetration of either moisture or air, will preserve perfectly for from 3 to 5 years. With the introduction of fresh water the food becomes reconstituted as when it was itself fresh.

This process produces a food output which is extremely light of weight. Most of the living tissue of animal and food products from the land have a greater percentage of their weight in water. This process has now been perfected to the point where integrity of the food quality is assured. The resulting food product needs none of the expensive refrigeration other fresh food distribution requires. Already numerous plants in the United States are processing chicken, shrimp, and coffee by the freeze-dry method. Combination foods, such as soup, are also in the production stage. With the help of purchases by the U.S. Army, by AID missions, and by other Government agencies, a volume operation would be possible to put into the market in places all over the world a competitive food product that would have an impact equal to that provided by frozen foods or by the discovery of canning. Although the process is, at this time, slightly more expensive than these other methods, the resulting product is so light in weight and has such a long shelf life and is capable of delivering such a superior product that it certainly deserves the support of any forward-looking nation.

A FISCAL POLICY FOR FOOD

It needs to be noted that no substantial progress in developing food potential will come without a commitment of substantial funds by our Government. Why, we ask, is it not as reasonable for Government to combine with the food industry for dramatic advance in the weaponry against hunger as for the Government to spend billions with the airframe and electronic industry in the race into space. We are buying the same basic governmental objectives. National security, national prestige, and national goodwill is what we get each time we shoot out into space a rocket on a several-hundred-million-dollar mission. We would score in each of these areas with a meaningful advance in producing, preserving, or distributing food to the starving millions who share this globe with us. A dollar invested in the food industry by Government would be a greater multiplier in the economic machine than the dollar spent in space. The food industry is as diverse as any in our economy so the effect of dollar input would spread. Each dollar would

buy more action than it does in the expensive sophisticated and specialized space industry. Of course we do not suggest reducing our effort in space.

We believe, that an invitation by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior to offer mission oriented projects for bid to the combined skills of the food industry and food scientists would amaze the world and greatly strengthen our country, just as such an invitation by the Defense Department and its partnership with the missile and space industry and its scientists has done in that area. After all, we only build bullets and bombs, missiles and rockets, to either store them or to destroy them. They have no productive place in our society or in our lives. Why can we not then afford to create food for distribution without too great a concern for the ability to make immediate or direct profit. Remember, that before men can increase standards of living such as will make them consumers of our goods, they must be educated. Before men can be educated they must be fed sufficiently well to provide an intelligent response to the teaching effort.

The first step toward a market of almost 2 billion people must be an improvement in diet. This is the fact that deserves, and should hold, our respectful attention. It is also a fact that justifies a reasonable investment.

May we point out that the thrust of this paper has avoided a damaging conflict with the distribution of other countries' food products. We have also been mindful of the restricting and frustrating limitations of food cultures, we have, therefore, suggested lines of endeavor which would, first, preserve foods and widen their arc of distribution, whatever the kind and quality in a given country; second, develop protein additives which can be assimilated and adapted to any class of food preference; third, encourage a processing method which reduces the weight, which is the principal cost factor in distribution, and lengthen the shelf life of food without expensive refrigeration and, finally, maintain the fresh quality of the food item or the combination being processed.

The great opportunity of the United States and its most promising contribution to its own goodwill and to the world's peace is to push forward with all haste and vigor the advent of the day of plenty for all peoples.

With the resources committed to the war in Vietnam for 1 year, we could hasten that day's arrival to within the next 10 year's span. Can we neglect the effort?

The great hope, the great challenge of our time, is to strike from the neck of mankind the tyrannical and demeaning yolk of hunger. The voice of Pope Paul the VI rings with this message in his historical address to the United Nations:

You must strive to multiply bread so that it suffices for the tables of mankind.

Here then lies the proven path to peace. Summons an arsenal of effective weaponry against the common enemy of man, hunger. It has been truly said

that peace cannot come to a world one-third well fed and two-thirds ill fed. It was the Prince of Peace himself who said:

If you love Me, feed My sheep.

O DICK RENDELL, WE WISH YOU WELL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the House radio gallery was lacking one of its most colorful and knowledgeable figures as the House convened on Monday for the 2d session of the 89th Congress. From the time of his accreditation to the radio gallery in 1934, Richard Rendell, chief of the Mutual Broadcasting System's Capitol Hill unit, and acknowledged dean of the radio gallery, has been absent from opening day ceremonies here only because of his military service in World War II and his work as a war correspondent in Korea.

I know my colleagues are familiar with my friend Dick Rendell's capabilities as a reporter and commentator during his long and dedicated association with the communications media of the Nation's Capitol. He has traveled with and reported on the daily developments affecting the Nation's great and near great. I am happy to say that he will continue to do so, although at the moment he is temporarily out of harness and a patient at the Washington Hospital Center. Dick Rendell, on January 5, underwent surgery on his left eye but is making excellent progress toward full recovery. On October 6, 1965, he underwent surgery on his right eye.

I had the pleasure of talking with Dick Rendell at the Washington Hospital Center yesterday and thus I can report that my fellow native of Waterbury, Conn., and Dartmouth alumnus was in fine spirits and confident of an early return to the Hill which he knows so well and where he is so deservedly admired.

VACHEL DAVIS OF ELDORADO, ILL.— MINE SAFETY PIONEER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, occasionally we should pause and give commendation to the people who have pioneered our country along the lines of our industries that have been a source of great economic development and progress in our time.

One of those people who has pioneered in mine safety is my friend and con-

stituent, Mr. Vachel Davis of Eldorado, Ill. For over 30 years he has made a valuable contribution to the safety and welfare of the coal miners of the United States. He spent a quarter of a century as staff cartoonist of the United Mine Workers Journal and, in addition, has contributed many coal mine safety posters and drawings, as well as poetry and editorials plugging and crusading for the coal miner's welfare and safety in the mines of our country.

He is responsible, with the help of Illinois State officials, to have erected a bronze statue at the State capitol in Springfield to the memory of all coal miners who have lost their lives in mine accidents, which is the only statue of its kind in any capitol of the United States.

I want to commend my friend, Vachel Davis, for his many years of service and contributions as a public servant to the welfare of the miners of our great country and who is deserving of all the recognition he has received for his unceasing efforts in behalf of the coal mine safety program of this valuable industry—that has served the United States in war and peace.

CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI—MICHEL- ANGELO OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a House concurrent resolution which would authorize procurement of a marble bust of the great artist, Constantino Brumidi, for placement in the Nation's Capitol.

It is a genuine pleasure for me to join the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, Hon. PAUL DOUGLAS, in introducing this legislation which would recognize Brumidi's genius and his magnificent contributions to the beautification of the Capitol.

I call upon all of my colleagues to join me in introducing similar concurrent resolutions to honor the memory of a great American who gave so much to our beautiful Capital City of Washington. The resolution directs the Joint Committee on the Library to secure a marble bust and have it placed in the corridor known as the Brumidi corridor located on the first floor of the Senate wing of the Capitol.

Evidence of Brumidi's genius is evident everywhere in the Capitol. His stirring murals, his colorful and expertly executed paintings, and his bold and moving frescoes, portraying supreme moments in American history, can be found in the corridors, in the committee rooms, and in the rotunda.

One of the outstanding examples of Brumidi's work is the President's Room on the Senate side of the Capitol where Brumidi labored for more than 6 months. This room has the distinction of being

called the most exquisitely decorated room in America.

Hundreds and thousands of visitors from every congressional district in America and from all parts of our Nation visit our Capitol. They view with admiration and with great awe the work of Brumidi.

Constantino Brumidi, the artist, was a political refugee from Italy who brought his career to an abrupt halt when he vowed he would not paint another stroke until he had found liberty. In 1852, at the age of 47, he sailed for the United States, and here he found the freedom he had sought for so long.

He began his work in the Capitol in 1855, and for 25 years thereafter, he worked devotedly and with all the strength and talent that he possessed to beautify the Capitol. He had a mission in life to perform and he performed that mission on behalf of his beloved America and this great city of Washington.

This great man took such outstanding pride in his adopted country that he signed all of his works simply, "C. Brumidi, Artist, Citizen of the United States."

All of us in the Congress know the story of his tragic death, the result of a fall at the age of 75.

The Members of this Congress appropriated the sum of \$400 in 1950 in order to mark his grave in Glenwood Cemetery which had been unmarked for over 50 years.

Mrs. Myrtle Murdock, wife of a former Congressman, took an interest in Brumidi and through her efforts, a bronze marker was finally provided in 1950 by the Congress.

There is no other tangible recognition of this great artist's contributions that can be found in the Nation's Capital today. For too long we have withheld the recognition that is so justly deserved by Constantino Brumidi. It is, therefore, entirely fitting, and proper, and appropriate, for the Congress to act with vigor in passing the House concurrent resolution which I have introduced today authorizing the placement of Brumidi's bust in the Capitol in Brumidi's corridor and thereby demonstrate to the entire world our Nation's gratitude to this great man and this great American.

Millions of schoolchildren throughout America, have been asking the question, "What does Constantino Brumidi look like?" By the passage of this resolution they will have the opportunity to view his bust in the Senate corridor named in his honor.

My distinguished colleagues, let us join together in answering this question of the schoolchildren of America by cooperating and passing without hesitancy or delay this House concurrent resolution which would place a marble bust of Brumidi in the Capitol for all to see.

COLD WAR VETERANS' BENEFITS ACT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROBERTS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the Korea emergency period was ended by Presidential proclamation, effective January 31, 1955, and service in the Armed Forces after that date is not legally considered wartime service. Since the veteran benefit structure is based on the concept of wartime and peacetime service, many benefits are denied to servicemen currently serving in the Armed Forces, even those serving under hostile conditions, because the current military situation has not been legally characterized as a war emergency. It is the purpose of the bill to provide war veteran benefits for veterans who entered service after January 31, 1955. The bill has the following major features:

First. Education and training benefits are provided for service after January 31, 1955, and for so long as the draft continues. These benefits accrue at the rate of 1½ days eligibility for each day of service, not to exceed 36 months. The education and training allowance is \$130 a month for full-time training, with proportionate amounts for three-fourths and one-half time training. Under this bill, training may be taken in colleges, below college level training, such as vocational courses, apprentice and on-the-job training, and farm training. The basic purpose of this educational program is to restore lost educational opportunity and assist the veteran in achieving the educational objectives which he likely would have achieved had his training not been interrupted by military service.

Second. Guaranteed and direct home loans are provided by this bill. The basic provisions of the Korea program are extended to this new cold war group. Seven thousand five hundred dollars of a loan made by a private lender may be guaranteed or, in certain areas declared as direct loan areas because of a shortage of mortgage financing, the Veterans' Administration may make a loan of up to \$15,000 directly to the veteran. A new feature has been added to the loan program in an effort to make it self-supporting. The veteran borrower would be required to pay a fee of one-half of 1 percent, one time, at closing, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. This fee would be placed in a revolving fund to indemnify the Administrator against losses growing out of default on the part of veteran borrowers.

Third. Under the service-connected compensation program in operation at the present time, veterans with a service-connected disability incurred in peacetime service receive 80 percent of the wartime compensation rate. This bill provides that veterans being discharged from service after January 31, 1955, with service-connected disabilities, will receive the wartime rate of compensation for a service-connected disability.

Fourth. The Veterans' Administration operates the largest hospital and medical system in the world. Veterans with service-connected disabilities and war veterans with non-service-connected disabilities are eligible for admission.

Those veterans with non-service-connected disabilities must sign a statement of inability to pay to gain admission. Peacetime veterans may not be admitted for non-service-connected disabilities. This bill makes veterans being discharged after January 31, 1955, eligible for hospitalization for non-service-connected disabilities if the veteran is otherwise qualified.

Fifth. War veterans are eligible for a \$250 burial allowance at death. Veterans with peacetime service are not eligible for this burial allowance. This bill makes those veterans being discharged after January 31, 1955, eligible for burial benefits.

Sixth. The Veterans' Administration operates a program which provides specially equipped automobiles for war veterans who have lost or lost the use of a limb from a service-connected cause. Peacetime veterans are not eligible for this benefit. This bill makes those veterans being discharged after January 31, 1955, eligible for an automobile grant if they have the qualifying disability.

Seventh. In order that there may be no misunderstanding as to the application of veterans' preference with regard to veterans serving after January 31, 1955, the bill contains a provision which grants veterans' preference to veterans with service during the qualifying period. Veterans discharged without a disability would be given 5 points preference and those discharged with service-connected disability would receive 10 points preference for employment in the Federal service.

The structure of veterans' laws which has developed over the past 200 years has been based on the concept of wartime and peacetime service. War veterans have been given substantially more benefits than peacetime veterans. This system worked very well through World War II. It was after World War II, when we entered the so-called cold war, that problems have arisen. It was during this period that we have continued compulsory military service for an extended period of time for the first time in our history. Prior to World War II, we had very few servicemen stationed outside the United States. Today our servicemen are scattered throughout the world, and in many instances are serving under combat or near-combat conditions. During the period of time which is covered by this bill, our Nation has gone through a series of crises associated with Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Taiwan-Matsu, Lebanon, Berlin, Laos, and Vietnam. The perpetual cold war condition, with its crises, compulsory military service, and expanded overseas commitments, make this bill necessary if our servicemen, during this tense period of history, are to receive equitable treatment.

ROA HONORS CONGRESSMAN PORTER HARDY, JR.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, on January 8, 1966, one of the senior Members and one of the most respected Members of this body, the Honorable PORTER HARDY, JR., was honor guest at a dinner in his home district at Norfolk, Va. On this occasion he was presented by the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States with ROA's Distinguished Service Citation, in recognition of his outstanding contributions to the safety and security of the United States. At the same time, he received a similar award on behalf of the Reserve Officers in the State of Virginia through their association.

I know of no Member of this House who more richly deserves this recognition, nor to whom it is given more appropriately from the citizen-soldiers who know him not only for his work here in the Nation's Capital but also for his service as a citizen-leader in his home community.

Some years ago the late Winston Churchill made the observation that a "Reserve officer is twice the citizen." In that respect, men like PORTER HARDY earned for themselves the respect and esteem for being "thrice the citizen."

The dinner to which I refer was sponsored by the Adm. David G. Farragut Chapter of the ROA at Norfolk. The president of this chapter, Lt. Col. LeRoy H. Jacobs, and the president of the Virginia Department of ROA, Col. Alexander Campbell-Murrelle II, both spoke in glowing tribute of Congressman HARDY. Their words reflect the general admiration and esteem in which thousands of his fellow Virginians regard PORTER HARDY.

Members of this House will, in my view, benefit from reading the outstanding address which our colleague gave on that occasion. I am including it herewith in my remarks as being rich in wisdom and counsel from a Member of Congress whose experience and dedication are known to us all:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN PORTER HARDY, JR.,
TO ADMIRAL DAVID G. FARRAGUT CHAPTER,
ROA, NORFOLK, JANUARY 8, 1966

As Reserve officers, most of you have experienced the terrible challenge of war. You, better than other groups in America, therefore, recognize that there is no substitute for military readiness.

Your awareness of the positive requirement for a military force second to none in the world is shared by most Members of Congress and accounts for the demonstrated unwillingness of the Congress to support Secretary McNamara in his broadside Reserve proposals until we are sure they will not reduce the strength of our Reserve Forces.

As the ranking majority member of the Hébert subcommittee, I participated in that subcommittee's successful effort to derail the McNamara locomotive which would have by now shoved the Army Reserve into the limbo of history.

Unfortunately, critics in some sections of the country castigated the subcommittee for its action which they interpret as simply another illustration of congressional obstructionism. These critics assume, I might add without basis, that a recommendation by the Executive, per se, must be good, and therefore demands immediate approval by the legislative branch of Government.

Many of these critics appear to believe that Congress does not have the professional competence to question recommendations of this kind from the executive branch and, therefore, they look for some ulterior political motive.

In this instance, the Committee on Armed Services was accused by some of seeking to protect a powerful, pressure group of reserve officers who were more concerned with their own personal situation than their Nation's problems of national security.

In short, the subcommittee was accused of engaging in political logrolling to satisfy and appease the selfish interest of our reserve officers.

You already know it, but let me reassert that the action taken by our subcommittee was without regard to any parochial or special interest group.

Not a single member of the subcommittee, either in public or private discussions with me, evidenced the slightest concern with the political results of the subcommittee's actions.

The members of the subcommittee were solely concerned with the national interest. That was the basis for their deliberations and the basis for their ultimate decision.

It would be a sad day indeed if organizations such as the ROA departed from the national scene and deprived Congress of the opportunity to look at the reverse side of the coin.

Since Congress presumably reflects the will of the people and in view of its duty and responsibility as provided under section I, article 8, of the Constitution, "to raise and support armies and to maintain a navy," it would certainly seem that the executive branch, and specifically Secretary McNamara would consult the Congress before announcing drastic changes in the Reserve program.

Sadly enough, this is not the case. You well recall the announcement of November 13, by which Mr. McNamara inactivated 751 Army Reserve units at one fell swoop. This was just 3 short weeks after Congress adjourned and was in direct conflict with specific Senate committee action. I do not think Mr. McNamara would have done this if Congress had been in session. Within a few days now when the Congress reconvenes we will be requested to approve the merger of the Army Reserve into the Army National Guard. At least this time the proposal is expected to contemplate authorizing legislation rather than a dictatorial executive order in defiance of the constitutional authority of Congress.

The Department of the Army, on November 18, 1965, sent a communication to all of its responsible component commands in which, among other things, it stated as follows:

"DOD and DA continue to support the 8-division, 16-brigade, 550,000 structure, all in the National Guard, and believe that this structure will serve best to meet national security requirements. When the Congress reconvenes in January, DOD and DA will urge the Congress to support the reorganization plan as originally proposed, and to enact the five items of legislation proposed by the Secretary of Defense in May 1965 as being necessary to accomplish fully the objectives of the proposed reorganization."

That, in a few words, reflects the arrogance of the Pentagon and its almost contemptuous disregard for the Congress. I doubt very much that it reflects the true military judgment of the Army. Rather, it may represent the imposition of command from DOD—so vividly expressed by General Johnson as "institutional constraint."

As a matter of fact, that same communication outlines the guidelines used for the preparation of the fiscal year 1967 budget for the Army's Reserve components, as follows:

"(a) The reorganization as initially proposed by the DA and DOD will be executed beginning July 1, 1966. The majority of

the reorganization will occur in the period July through September; it will be completed by December 31.

"(b) Each corps headquarters will be inactivated not sooner than 30 days after the last of its USAR paid drill units are phased into the National Guard or are inactivated. All corps will be inactivated on or before March 31, 1967.

"(c) Fiscal year 1967 end strength will be 580,000, including an add-on of 30,000 for the selected Reserve Force, all of which will be in the National Guard.

"(d) 60,000 fillers will be authorized for fiscal year 1967.

"(e) The technician authorization for fiscal year 1967 will be continued at the present level of 27,220 (exclusive of civil defense technicians) plus the number of technicians required by the augmented strength of the selected Reserve Force. The phasing of technicians from the USAR to the NG will be in accordance with the reorganization schedule."

Finally, the messages indicate that: "Reorganization planning in accordance with the foregoing will be resumed. State troop lists for the 550,000 structure continue as enunciated in reference (a). Scheduling should be adjusted to contemplate reorganization beginning on July 1, 1966, and continuing thereafter generally along the lines planned for the 1965 reorganization."

Now, I don't want to prejudge the legislative proposals, and certainly I believe they should and will receive careful consideration by the committee and the Congress. But already I see in this situation the kind of Executive pressure of Congress which is, in my view, both distasteful and improper. Unless we adopt the Pentagon proposals Mr. McNamara will point out that since its planning and funding for the next fiscal year had been predicated on the assumption that Congress will grant this authority by July 1966, the failure of Congress to do so will jeopardize the national interest and the national security.

The press then will be persuaded to drag up all the old familiar clichés about the obstructionism in Congress and its inability to act positively to meet the new challenges of history.

Perhaps Congress does on occasion act slowly and deliberately. But is this not in reality one of the great functions of the legislative branch? Let me explain.

One of the great merits in any form of government based upon the separation of legislative and executive powers is the fact that in its necessity to deliberate and debate the merits of an action proposed by the Executive, it often avoids costly and tragic national errors.

In the political history of modern times, beginning in 1776, the continuing ability of our form of government to function, and function well, is in itself eloquent testimony to the effectiveness of the legislative process.

To quote a political contemporary on Capitol Hill: "Our Government is much like an old scow. It does not move fast; it does not move very far at one time; but it does not sink."

We call ourselves a young country—and we are. But keep in mind that our form of representative government is the oldest continuing political system in the world. At its own steady pace, the scow proceeds on the river of time—while flashier craft have gone aground or gone to the bottom.

The great stabilizer of that system is the very slow-poke quality built into the elaborate constitutional separation of powers.

We are a Federal Union as well as a representative democracy. Those two characteristics create the two Houses of Congress and lead directly to the sometimes, perhaps maddening, but indispensable deliberations of the democratic process.

Every dictator that we have known in modern times has been a "benevolent despot." His assumption of powers was, the despot claims, not for his own aggrandizement, but for his "nation's welfare."

In short, he justifies temporarily setting aside the democratic legislative process on the pretext of being able to swiftly provide otherwise unattainable efficiencies in government.

Ridiculous? Of course it is. We know, and appreciate, that liberty and freedom cannot be turned on and off like a light bulb.

We know that if the people—through their Congress—forget their right to draft our laws—they also forfeit their freedom.

Yet, there are people today—a few I hope—who consider that our deliberative body, the Congress, is an "unnecessary evil."

They would, if given the opportunity, reduce the Congress to a mere rubberstamp for the Executive. This then would enable the executive branch of Government to exercise its infinite wisdom to effect radical changes now resisted by the representatives of the electorate.

Your Congress is therefore, in a very literal sense, our Nation's front line defense against threats from within to the liberties of us all.

The Congress fulfills this mission by the explicit and daily exercise of its constitutional authority. It does this by reflecting the will of the people—and not the will of the Executive in the laws that it writes.

To the everlasting credit of our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, his committee has led the fight to emphasize that Congress, under the Constitution, must assert its constitutional responsibility "to raise and maintain armies."

During the 1st session of the 89th Congress, the executive branch was told in no uncertain terms that its military pay recommendation was grossly inadequate; and the committee, against the strongest Executive pressure, wrote its own bill. Both the House and Senate unanimously supported the committee's action—and the committee's action became law.

The Congress, again in connection with the proposal to merge the Reserve Forces, also demonstrated its independence of the executive branch in asserting its constitutional responsibility by prescribing minimum strengths for our Reserve components.

Recently, most Members of Congress were taken by surprise when the Secretary of Defense, acting for the President, announced determinations of the Executive to use the stockpile disposal program as a means of economic control.

Now, at the moment, it is not my intention to pass upon the objectives of these actions, nor to question whether it was in the national interest to utilize the disposal of aluminum and the disposal of copper from the national stockpiles as a means of preventing an inflationary increase in prices. However, I do seriously question the propriety of the action taken by the executive branch.

It is my intention to urge the Committee on Armed Services and the Congress to inquire into this matter in depth since, in my judgment, it is yet another illustration of the Executive infringing on the powers of Congress.

In pursuing an inquiry concerning the possible abuse by the Executive of statutory power—Congress again will make its unique and positive contribution to our democracy.

Only a little more than 2 years ago, a great American, in commenting on the right and the responsibility to question the Executive's use of power, commented as follows:

"We therefore can pay honor to the deepest source of our national strength.

"That strength takes many forms, and the most obvious are not always the most significant."

"The men who create power make an indispensable contribution to the Nation's greatness, but the men who question power make a contribution just as indispensable, especially when that questioning is disinterested, for they determine whether we use power or power uses us."

This statement, emphasizing the responsibility of Americans to question the use of power was made by John F. Kennedy in his speech honoring the late poet, and former member of Amherst College faculty, Robert Frost, on October 26, 1963.

We need to stop the growing tendency of the Executive to ignore the will of the Congress by reading into the statutes authority which was never intended.

I am confident that the 2d session of the 89th Congress will enact new legislation concerning the Reserve Forces. There is always room for improvement, but I know the committee will want to be sure that the changes will improve our defense posture. I feel certain also that any new legislation adopted will include provisions to protect the constitutional rights and responsibilities of the Congress. And perhaps it may be necessary to spell out more clearly and to limit more specifically the authority delegated by Congress to the Department of Defense.

Our reserve subcommittee chairman, Mr. HÉBERT, has indicated that he is thinking along this same line, and I expect him to support fixing by statute the minimum strengths for each of the Reserve components.

This will leave no doubt as to the will of the Congress in this regard.

I have rambled tonight—but with a purpose. I have attempted to point out that the ramparts of freedom must be guarded by every American—be he a member of the general public, a member of our Reserve Forces, or a Member of Congress. Each has his role to play.

Each must make his daily contribution in the support of liberty by being eternally vigilant, not only with regard to external enemies, but also against the abuse of power by uncontrolled Central Government.

CHAD INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FARNUM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, January 11, marks the observance of independence day for Chad, a former colony of France. Though Chad's formal independence was achieved on August 11, 1960, the Government declared January 11, 1961, as its first national celebration of the event.

Chad is more than twice the size of France and has a population rapidly approaching 3 million persons. Historically, the French were exploring the area now known as Chad as early as 1891, but were able to learn very little about the country's early existence. However, France quickly recognized Chad's strategic importance and in 1900, during the French quest for empire in West Africa, Chad was organized as a military area. In 1910 it became one of the four territories of French Equatorial Africa, which was dissolved in 1959, at the time Chad became a fully autonomous member of the French community.

The people of Chad are justly proud of their country's role in support of the free French forces during World War II. During the bleak period of Nazi Germany's drive into north Africa, Chad was the first African colony to rally to France's call for assistance and it played an important part in the Allied thrust into north Africa to defeat Rommel's desert forces. Cooperation between the former colony and metropole have continued, and relations have grown even closer as a result of increased trade and French technical assistance.

The United States has viewed sympathetically the gallant struggle in which President Francois Tombalbaye and his government have been engaged in an attempt to accelerate Chad's economic development and help her people realize more of the fruits of independence.

Various geographic handicaps such as a scarcity of known mineral resources, a lack of many power resources, and a landlocked position with few rail lines serve as serious barriers to the country's achieving the rapid economic growth to which the Government is firmly committed. However, the picture is not all bleak since Chadian trade has increased remarkably, she is self-sufficient in food production, and she has a growing fishing industry which will bring in needed revenues.

I am certain that I speak in behalf of the Congress and the American people in expressing best wishes and warm congratulations to the President of the Republic, Francois Tombalbaye; Minister of Foreign Affairs, Jacques Baroum; Minister of State for National Defense, Robert Delsia Soussia; His Excellency Boukar Abdoul, Chad's Ambassador to the United States, and all of the people of Chad on their anniversary.

HURRICANE BETSY LOSSES AND YOUR INCOME TAX

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, as you know, late in September my State was struck by one of the most devastating hurricanes in the history of our country. That storm, Hurricane Betsy, did hundreds of millions of dollars in damages. Our National Government and Congress responded in many ways, including the passage of bills calling for the rehabilitation of schools, public buildings, and more especially, the so-called Betsy bill, which aided thousands of homeless and afflicted.

There were many stories of bravery and leadership in the wake of the hurricane, and they continue to unfold as our area completes the job of rehabilitation.

The New Orleans Times-Picayune, which is one of the oldest and most successful newspapers in our country, despite the almost total disruption of communications, and the New Orleans

States-Item, both published by the Times-Picayune Publishing Corp., never missed a single edition. This in itself was a remarkable record and brought commendation from the journalistic profession.

More recently, the newspapers sponsored, under the direction of Mr. George Healy, widely known executive editor of the Times-Picayune and New Orleans States-Item, and their distinguished Washington correspondent, Mr. Edgar A. Poe, a tax institute at the New Orleans Municipal Auditorium.

This institute was held in connection with an informative series that the Times-Picayune ran on details of reporting hurricane losses on income tax forms.

It was a huge success, exceeding the expectations of its sponsors. On the night of December 15, over 3,200 people jammed the municipal auditorium in New Orleans to hear officials of the Internal Revenue Service and the Louisiana State Department of Revenue discuss tax relief due as a result of the hurricane, and following the meeting the newspaper received almost 20,000 requests for information on reporting losses.

I include herewith a copy of the series, from the Times-Picayune, based on information prepared by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service and the Louisiana Department of Revenue, along with newspaper accounts of the institute:

RECORD OF STORM DAMAGE SHOULD BE PREPARED AS SOON AS POSSIBLE

This is the first of a series of articles discussing the Federal and State income tax treatment of casualty losses. Many types of losses come within the casualty loss category; however, these discussions will be limited to nonbusiness losses of the type resulting from Hurricane Betsy.

As soon as possible a record should be made of the damages caused by Hurricane Betsy. This record should be as complete as possible and should list the damages to real property, which is land and buildings or other immovable improvements, and should list the items of personal property, which is movable property such as furniture, clothing, etc., which was damaged or destroyed. To the extent possible you should also have records to show that you are the owner of the property, the cost or other basis of the property, the amount of depreciation allowed or allowable (if any), the value of the property before and after the casualty and the amount of insurance or other compensation received or expected to be received.

A deduction for a loss is allowed only for the actual physical damage to your property resulting from the casualty. The losses are subject to certain limitations in computing the amount which may be deducted on your return. These limitations will be covered in later discussions.

Any decrease in the value of the property because it is in or near a disaster area and because there is a possibility that the area may again have a similar disaster is not a casualty loss. The basic measure of a casualty loss is the difference between the fair market value of the property immediately before the casualty and its fair market value immediately after the casualty.

The cost of repairs to the damaged property is an acceptable measure of the decrease in value and thus the loss if the taxpayer shows that (1) the repairs are necessary to restore the property to its pre-casualty condition, (2) the amount spent for the repairs is

not excessive, (3) the repairs do not care for more than the damage suffered, and (4) the value of the property after the repairs does not as a result of the repairs exceed the value of the property immediately before the casualty.

ENTIRE PROPERTY MUST BE CONSIDERED AND EXPERT APPRAISAL MAY BE MADE

In computing the amount of the casualty loss resulting from physical damage to real property the entire property must be considered as a unit. For example, if you own a lot on which your residence is located and the only damage inflicted by Betsy was the uprooting of a large tree, your loss is the difference between the fair market value of the entire property immediately before the casualty and its fair market value immediately after the casualty. You may not base your loss on the value of the tree which was destroyed.

The best means to establish the fair market values of real property is to have an appraisal made by an expert real estate appraiser. Whether or not this is necessary or feasible will depend upon the circumstances in each case and the decision must be made by the individuals concerned.

Computation of the casualty loss from damage to real property is illustrated by the following examples.

Example 1. Mr. A owns a home which received extensive damage from Betsy consisting of wind damage and damage from flood water. The fair market value of the entire property immediately before the casualty was \$18,000. As a result of the physical damage to the property the fair market value immediately after the casualty was only \$15,000. Mr. A's loss is \$3,000.

Example 2. Mr. B owns a home which received extensive damage from Betsy. The fair market value of the entire property was \$18,000 immediately before Betsy hit. Repairs for the damages caused by the storm cost Mr. B \$2,700. These repairs were necessary to restore the property to its precasualty condition, the amount for the repairs made was not excessive, the repairs were not more than necessary to take care of the damage suffered, and the value of the property after the repairs is not more than \$18,000. Mr. B's loss is \$2,700.

The examples above do not consider the limitations which will be discussed later or insurance proceeds or other compensation which will also be discussed later.

SEPARATE COMPUTATION MUST BE MADE FOR EACH ITEM OF PERSONAL PROPERTY

The amount of the casualty loss from damage or destruction of personal property is also the difference between the fair market value of the property immediately before the casualty and the fair market value of the property immediately after the casualty. A separate computation is made for each item of personal property. Any relationship between the cost of replacement and the amount of the loss is merely accidental.

Assuming that you have prepared a list of the articles of personal property which were damaged or destroyed by Betsy, you should enter by each item in columns (1) its cost or other basis to you, (2) its value before the casualty, (3) its value after the casualty, (4) the decrease in value, and (5) the amount of the loss.

A form to aid in the computation of your Betsy loss has been devised and printed by the New Orleans district office of the Internal Revenue Service and will be available upon request after December 15.

At this point it is necessary to discuss the limitation on the amount of the loss on non-business assets which has been mentioned in earlier discussions. These limitations apply to losses of personal property and real property.

The loss on a property is the decrease in fair market value resulting from physical damage to the property by the casualty. The loss may not exceed your cost or other basis in the property. This limitation could only arise if the fair market value before the casualty is greater than your basis. On the other hand, your loss may not exceed the fair market value of the asset immediately before the casualty. This limitation arises only if the fair market value of the property immediately before the casualty was less than your basis. You will find that this is an important factor in determining your loss on personal property.

These limitations are brought out in the following examples:

Example 3. Mr. A. purchased real property for \$10,000 in 1948 which he has used only as a personal residence since that time. The fair market value before Betsy hit was \$18,000. Due to the physical damage caused by Betsy the fair market value of the property after the casualty was \$6,000. The decrease in value is \$12,000 but Mr. A's loss is limited to his basis of \$10,000.

Example 4. Mr. B. purchased a boat for \$2,000 in 1960 which he used only for personal recreation. The fair market value of the boat immediately before Betsy hit was \$1,000. The boat was completely destroyed by the casualty and so salvage was realized. Mr. B's loss is \$1,000, measured by the precasualty value of the property rather than his cost.

DEDUCTION IS ALLOWED FOR SPECIFIC DAMAGES NOT COVERED BY INSURANCE

In our prior discussions we have considered the limitations applied in computing the amount of the casualty loss. We should now consider the steps necessary to compute the amount of the deduction to be claimed on your income tax return.

The statute allows a deduction to individuals for specific types of losses sustained during the taxable year and not compensated for by insurance or otherwise. The deduction for losses of nonbusiness property arising from casualties is included in these losses but there is a further provision that nonbusiness casualty losses are allowable only to the extent that the amount of the loss to such individual arising from each casualty exceeds \$100.

At this time we will consider the \$100 limitation feature and leave the discussion of compensation by insurance or otherwise until later.

The \$100 limitation feature applies to each individual taxpayer for each casualty. This will be illustrated by the following examples.

Example 5. Mr. A owns an auto which cost him \$3,000. The fair market value of the auto was \$700 immediately before Betsy hit. During the course of the storm a tree fell on the auto which resulted in its value being reduced to salvage value only which amounted to \$50. Mr. A was not compensated for his loss by insurance or otherwise. His loss is \$650 and his deduction is limited to the amount in excess of \$100 or \$550.

Example 6. Mr. A and Mr. B jointly own a boat which they use only for recreation purposes. They paid \$2,000 for the boat and its fair market value immediately before Betsy hit was \$1,500. The boat was completely demolished by the casualty and there was no salvage realized. Their loss was \$750 each but they may each deduct their loss which is in excess of \$100, therefore they each may deduct \$650.

This feature will be considered further in our next discussion.

State law differs in that deductions for State income tax purposes do not have a deductible feature, whereby the amount claimed is reduced by \$100. Under State law, all losses are included with no deductions.

THE \$100 DEDUCTIBLE FEATURE ALSO APPLIES TO MULTIPLE DAMAGE FROM ONE CAUSE

We have considered a loss of property which was jointly owned by two individuals, now we shall consider multiple losses from a single casualty.

Suppose that Mr. A owns a home which was damaged by Betsy's high winds and was flooded by the resulting high water brought by Betsy. The flood water also damaged Mr. A's auto and much of his household furnishings, appliances, and clothing. Let us also suppose that Mr. A received no compensation by insurance or otherwise for his losses.

Since all of these losses resulted from a single casualty the amount by which his total losses exceed \$100 is the amount of his deduction on his income tax return.

If Mr. A had a loss from an auto accident in April 1965, in addition to the Betsy losses, the amount of this loss is also limited to the amount which is in excess of \$100.

In our discussion concerning jointly owned property we considered the rule that each of the owners is subject to the \$100 limitation for each casualty. There is an exception to this rule in the case of a husband and wife who file a joint return.

If a husband and wife jointly own property which is damaged by a casualty their combined loss will be considered as the loss of one taxpayer for the purposes of applying the \$100 limitation if they file a joint return.

Suppose that Mr. and Mrs. A jointly own their home which suffered damage from Betsy and they are not compensated for the loss by insurance or otherwise. If they file a joint return the amount by which the total loss exceeds \$100 is the amount of their deduction. If Mr. and Mrs. A file separate returns they must each make a separate computation of their loss and each apply the \$100 limitation to determine the amount to be deducted on their separate returns.

As mentioned in a previous article, there is no \$100 deductible feature under Louisiana law applying to State income tax. Under Louisiana law, all losses are included with no deductions.

VALUE OF SHRUBBERY, TREES MAY NOT BE COMPUTED AS FACTOR OF DAMAGES

In one of our earlier discussions we considered the fact that in computing the amount of the casualty loss of real property the entire property must be considered as a unit. We also discussed the conditions under which the cost of repairs could be used to measure the loss.

Let us now consider further the loss to real property resulting from destruction of trees or shrubbery. While the value of these separate items may not be used to determine the amount of the loss, the total of the actual expenditures for (1) removing destroyed or damaged trees and shrubbery, less any salvage recovered, (2) pruning or other measures taken to preserve damaged trees and shrubs, and (3) replanting necessary to restore the property to its approximate value before the casualty may, where appropriate, serve as evidence of the amount of loss to the property due to the damage to trees and shrubbery.

Since we have considered the various methods of measuring the amount of casualty losses and the limitations which must be considered to determine the amount of the deduction to be claimed, we should now consider items which are related to Betsy losses and which may be subject to some confusion.

Food, medical supplies, and other forms of subsistence which you receive do not reduce the amount of your casualty loss deduction. Neither does the receipt of these items by you result in taxable income to you.

The cost of appraisals made to establish the amount of your loss resulting from a casualty is not a part of the casualty loss

deduction but is an expense of determining your income tax liability and is deductible as such if you itemize your nonbusiness deductions for the year in which the fees are paid. The cost of photographs made to assist in making the appraisals or to establish the nature of the damages is also subject to this treatment.

Under State law certain deductions may be made even though the items of expense occur on property the taxpayer does not own. Among those items are the expense of removing blown-down trees, pruning shrubbery, and removing debris. These costs will be allowed as casualty losses by Louisiana even though the taxpayer does not own the property, if he, in fact, paid the necessary cost.

DEDUCTION IS ALLOWED FOR NONBUSINESS DAMAGES NOT COVERED BY INSURANCE

A deduction is allowed for nonbusiness casualty losses sustained during the year and not compensated for by insurance or otherwise but limited to the amount by which the loss from each casualty exceeds \$100. As we have covered the \$100 limitation feature, this article will be devoted to insurance recoveries or other compensation for losses.

We believe that insurance proceeds will not present a problem. If your property was damaged by Betsy to the extent of \$2,000 and you are compensated for your loss by insurance proceeds in the amount of \$1,500, you have sustained a loss of \$500 not compensated for by insurance.

We expect that most of your problems will concern financial assistance from sources other than insurance. Amounts received from the Red Cross or other disaster relief agencies for the purpose of restoring or rehabilitating property lost or damaged by Betsy are treated the same as insurance proceeds. However, amounts received from these agencies as disaster relief for food, medical supplies and other forms of subsistence have no effect on the amount of your casualty loss deduction and are not includible in your income.

Amounts received from a disaster relief fund maintained by your employer, if the amounts are not compensation for services, for the purpose of restoring or rehabilitating property lost or damaged by Betsy are also treated the same as insurance proceeds.

Any amounts which you receive as gifts from your relatives, friends and neighbors do not reduce the amount of your casualty loss deduction even though you use all or part of the gifts to restore or rehabilitate the property lost or damaged by Betsy.

At this time we do not know what the income-tax effect will be of the partial forgiveness of disaster loans made by the Small Business Administration. This matter is presently under study in the Washington office of the Internal Revenue Service, and as soon as an answer is received it will be issued as a press release to this newspaper.

CLAIM FOR DAMAGES MAY BE CARRIED TO PREVIOUS YEAR AS TAX DEDUCTION

This discussion will be devoted to the deduction of nonbusiness casualty losses. The discussion will be limited to Betsy losses of nonbusiness property. If you realized a gain on the disposition of business assets during 1965 or if you realized a gain on an involuntary conversion of property into money or other property, this discussion may not apply to the treatment of your nonbusiness casualty loss.

Nonbusiness deductions are claimed on page 2 of form 1040. If you file form 1040A you may not claim nonbusiness deductions.

Your casualty loss should be claimed in the section "Other deductions" on page 2 of form 1040. In this space you should identify the deduction and show the amount. The com-

putation of the deduction should be shown on a separate schedule attached to your return and the computation should include any amount compensated for by insurance or otherwise. The special form designed by the New Orleans district office should be helpful in making a correct computation of the allowable deduction.

If you claim a casualty loss deduction you will also want to claim your other nonbusiness deduction such as contributions, taxes, interest and medical expenses as well as any expenses incurred in determining the amount of your casualty loss if they were paid during the year of the casualty.

If your casualty loss exceeds your income for the year of the casualty you may have a net operating loss which can be carried to a prior taxable year as an additional deduction for that year or carried over to subsequent years.

A net operating loss is a carryback to the third preceding taxable year and any excess is a carryover to the following taxable years, in the order listed or until no excess remains, (1) the second preceding year, (2) the first preceding year, and (3) each of the five subsequent years.

If you have a net operating loss you may file a claim for refund for the prior year to which the loss is carried. A claim for refund may be filed at any time before the 15th day of the 40th month following the close of the loss year. A refund will be made only after the correct amount of the refund has been determined.

You may apply for a quick refund of a prior year's tax by filing form 1045 for a tentative adjustment of taxes which are affected by a net operating loss carryback. Form 1045 must be filed within 12 months from the end of the loss year. Filing of form 1045 will result in a quick refund which is subject to final adjustment at a later date.

Since net operating losses may become quite complicated we urge you to take advantage of the assistance which will be offered in our final discussion if you believe that you are entitled to a carryback to prior years.

Louisiana income tax laws differ in that the entire amount of hurricane loss is deductible only in 1965 and no part of the deduction can be carried back to a prior year or forwarded to a subsequent year.

EXAMPLE INCLUDES PRINCIPLES TAKEN UP IN ARTICLES PREVIOUSLY OFFERED

This article will be devoted to an example which we hope will include all of the principles previously discussed and some of the problems with which you will be most concerned.

Example 7. Mr. and Mrs. Doe own their home which they purchased in 1960 for \$18,000. The fair market value of this property was \$19,000 immediately before Betsy hit. Their home was damaged by Betsy's high winds and floodwaters. Their auto which cost \$3,000 and which had a value of \$1,600 was severely damaged by the floodwaters. Their furniture, appliances, clothing, the children's toys and other personal effects were damaged in varying degrees by the floodwater.

Mr. and Mrs. Doe prepared a list of the family's personal effects which were damaged or destroyed by Betsy, using the lower of cost or value immediately before the casualty and the value (if any) of each item after the casualty. They determined that the total amount of their loss on these items was \$3,500.

The value of their home after the casualty was determined to be \$14,000 and the entire decrease in value was due to the physical damage to the property.

Mr. and Mrs. Doe were compensated for their loss to the extent of \$300 insurance for wind damage to their home, they received \$1,600 for a total loss settlement on their

auto, but the insurance company received the auto, and they received \$1,000 from a disaster relief agency for the purpose of restoring or rehabilitating property lost or damaged in the casualty.

Their casualty loss deduction is computed as follows:

Loss on home (\$19,000 less \$14,000) ..	\$5,000
Less insurance recovered	300
	<hr/> 4,700
Personal effects	3,500
Auto	1,600
Less insurance recovered	1,600
	<hr/> 0
Excess of loss over insurance recovery ..	8,200
Payment from disaster relief agency ..	1,000
	<hr/> 7,200
Total loss to Mr. and Mrs. Doe ..	7,200
Less \$100 limitation on nonbusiness losses	100
	<hr/> 7,100
Amount of casualty loss deduction to be claimed	7,100

If the above amount exceeds their income for 1965 the Does may file a claim for refund of 1962 income tax or they may request a tentative adjustment of 1962 income tax by filing form 1045.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE OFFERING INFORMATION ON TAX IN PUBLICATIONS

In this concluding discussion of Betsy losses we will summarize some of the prior discussions and list sources of additional information in case the answer to your problem has not been included in one of our articles.

We hope that you have prepared a detailed list of the personal effects which were damaged or destroyed by Betsy. This list not only will assist you in supporting the deduction which you claim on your return but will be a valuable aid in preventing your overlooking items lost. The more time that elapses before your list is prepared the greater are the chances of omitting articles from your list.

The amount of your casualty loss is determined by the reduction of the property's value by physical damage inflicted by the casualty, subject to the limitations discussed. Your Betsy loss is deductible on your 1965 income tax return even though you have not made the repairs. Of course, if you measure the loss by the actual expenditures made for repairs, the amount can not be computed until the amount of the repairs is known but the loss was still sustained during 1965 and is a deduction for that year.

Another feature of casualty losses is the adjustment which must be made to the basis of property for computing the gain or loss on the subsequent sale or other disposition. This adjustment requires that the basis be reduced by the amount of the damage to the property and that the cost of repairs made to correct the damage should be added to the reduced basis. This feature will not affect your current deduction of the casualty loss but must be taken into account in computing the gain or loss in the year in which the property is sold.

Detailed information about casualty losses is available in Internal Revenue Service Document No. 5174 (12-64) which may be obtained free of charge upon request from any Internal Revenue Service office.

Internal Revenue Service information publications "Your Federal Income Tax" and "Tax Guide for Small Business" include the information on casualty losses as well as detailed information to aid you in preparing your income tax return. These publications are available at most Internal Revenue Service offices for 50 cents a copy.

You can receive personal assistance with your casualty loss problems by calling the nearest Internal Revenue Service office. In New Orleans the number is 527-2435.

Written requests for assistance should be addressed to the District Director of Internal Revenue, Post Office Box 30309, New Orleans, La., 70130.

Questions pertaining to Louisiana income tax should be addressed to Louisiana Department of Revenue, State Office Building, 325 Loyola, New Orleans, La., 70112.

THOROUGH CROSS SECTION OF AREA PEOPLE PRESENT—MORE THAN 3,000 GIVEN MANY ANSWERS

(By Gene Barnes)

Municipal auditorium had what was probably its most attentive audience in years Tuesday night.

The occasion was the Hurricane Betsy Tax Institute; and the crowd, estimated at more than 3,000, had money on its mind.

It was a thorough cross section of people in this area. There were executive types in tailored suits and fishermen in overalls. There were women in furs and women in slacks.

Almost everyone had at least two things in common—they had suffered losses from Hurricane Betsy and they were determined to save as much as possible on their Federal and State income taxes because of it.

WOMAN TAKES NOTES

The crowd seemed to hang on every word. A Negro woman took copious notes. An elderly man sat literally on the edge of his seat, straining to hear. A middle-aged matron whispered in her husband's ear and looked apologetically at his neighbors.

The institute, sponsored by the Times-Picayune and New Orleans States-Item, was held about tax problems resulting from Betsy's foray.

An estimated 30,000 persons will file losses on their income taxes next year because of Betsy.

Homer Lindsay, deputy State fire marshal at the auditorium, estimated that 3,200 of them were in attendance—despite rainy weather.

Not everyone stayed to the end. "I found out what I want to know," said an old man, donning his raincoat and departing about 15 minutes before the end of the program.

ANSWERS SOUGHT

But for every one who left early at least five others stayed after the formal program ended, to swarm around a battery of Federal and State experts and seek answers to specific problems.

And the program was not without laughter. One speaker lauded the ability of residents of this area to be humorous in the face of adversity.

As an example, he told of a letter a woman gave to her husband for mailing to the Times-Picayune. In the letter, she asked how much she could deduct on a 15-year-old wedding dress ruined by floodwaters.

The husband posted the letter, but before he did, he wrote this postscript at the bottom: "She lost the thing 15 years ago. I wish she had lost it 16 years ago."

Judging from a number of persons interviewed, most of the audience sought general information; but a large number had specific problems.

Mrs. Anthony K. Keko, who had to move from her home in Buras to Metairie following Betsy's devastation, estimated her family lost more than \$75,000 in the storm. She also lost her 77-year-old father-in-law, Gergo Keko, whose body still has not been found.

TAKING COURSE

Mrs. Keko said she is taking a course on taxes to learn more about her situation but attended the institute in hopes of picking up additional information.

"How can I save money and pay Uncle Sam as little as possible," was the way Michael J. Liuzza, Sr., put it when asked why he was attending.

Liuzza, of 220 Serpas in Carolyn Park, said he had 6 feet of water in his home and estimated his total losses at \$40,000.

"I think it's wonderful when the Government and newspapers team up to help people not familiar with tax laws," he said.

Mrs. Paul Barriere, a Negro mother of 10, said, "All we had left was a mirror on the wall" after Betsy.

Even after the Small Business Administration forgiveness grant "we still will have lost plenty," she said. "I'm trying to find out how much of a tax refund we can expect."

TWOFOLD PURPOSE

Joseph J. Calo, 582 Rosa Avenue, Metairie, had a twofold purpose in attending. He was a tax accountant seeking to find answers for his clients and a homeowner looking for personal answers as well.

One of his questions had to do with carry-back and carry-forward losses. He got the answer from Internal Revenue Service men there.

Mrs. Raymond Gautreaux said information pamphlets and forms distributed at the institute should answer most of her questions.

"I've been doing our own income tax forms since we've been married and I ought to be able to figure them out without too much difficulty," she said.

Mrs. Gautreaux's family had to leave its home at 3027 Music after suffering losses of some \$10,000. The family is temporarily living at 4702 Perla.

Louis Barnes, 101 Nutria Drive, Chalmette, and George Santos, 3106 Jackson Boulevard, Chalmette, said the institute was both educational and constructive.

Another man seemed extremely pleased to learn that he can deduct the loss of food spoiled in his freezer because of no electricity. "That alone made it worth the trip here," he said.

DEDUCT "FORGIVEN" SBA LOAN, STORM VICTIMS ARE ADVISED—TAX STEPS OUTLINED HERE BY EXPERTS

(By Clarence Doucet)

Hurricane victims who made Small Business Administration loans must deduct the "forgiven" part of their loan from the total casualty loss from Betsy claimed in their 1965 Federal income tax returns.

That announcement came Wednesday night at the Hurricane Betsy Tax Institute at Municipal Auditorium.

The institute was sponsored by the Times-Picayune and the New Orleans States-Item.

Harold LeBlanc, Federal revenue agent from Baton Rouge, made the announcement about the SBA loans as he outlined the Internal Revenue Service's policy regarding recovery of Betsy victims from sources other than insurance.

He said the "forgiveness" part of the SBA loan is considered as "compensation other than insurance."

RELIEF CITED

Along the same lines, the IRS announced that money made available by "disaster relief" agencies must also be considered a recovery other than insurance.

In these cases, as well, any recovery or reimbursement received from these groups would reduce the casualty loss claimed on tax returns, he said.

LeBlanc was one of several Federal and State income tax officials who addressed the institute.

An IRS official said that more than 4,000 packages, which contained information and forms for filing Federal and State income tax returns, were handed to persons as they entered the auditorium.

Actual attendance was estimated by a fire marshal at more than 3,200.

Chester A. Usry, New Orleans district director for the IRS, headed the Federal tax officials. William E. Tuttle, Baton Rouge, director of individual income tax for the Louisiana Department of Revenue, headed the State revenue department delegation.

Other IRS officials who spoke included Ralph P. Hebert, chief, audit division, New Orleans district; and Thomas Byrnes, revenue agent and senior instructor, New Orleans district.

Edgar Poe, Washington correspondent for the Times-Picayune, was master of ceremonies.

PUBLIC SERVICE

Poe explained that the sole purpose of the institute was to "provide a public service." He said one result will be to minimize the income taxes of persons who suffered losses due to Hurricane Betsy.

Usry announced that the IRS office in New Orleans will have a special telephone service for hurricane victims who wish additional information about their particular problems. Betsy victims desiring this assistance should dial 527-2371.

Usry also announced that beginning January 3, 1966, specially trained personnel will be available to assist taxpayers in person in Room 117 in the Federal Building at 600 South.

He urged hurricane victims to file their returns before February 15 to avoid the delay which usually comes after that date.

"If you send them to us after February 15," Usry added, "your returns will hit us with 100,000 others, and I don't know when you'd get your refund in that case."

Byrnes defined casualty tax losses—in this case Betsy losses—noting that for tax purposes they are divided into real property losses and personal property losses. Combined, they represent the total casualty loss.

He said that food, medical supplies and subsistence given to hurricane victims does not reduce their casualty loss.

LeBlanc, in addition to announcing the IRS policy concerning "forgiveness" loans, also answered in general terms questions submitted to the IRS via the Times-Picayune.

He emphasized that any losses because of Betsy are 1965 losses and must be reported in 1965 returns. He also emphasized that, though some lost items may have had great sentimental value to the owner, they must be reported at their actual worth immediately before the hurricane.

Hebert urged taxpayers to "be reasonable in estimating the values of articles damaged or destroyed."

He said revenue agents and auditors have been reminded to "be reasonable and practical when considering the values reported on income tax returns."

Hebert also said taxpayers should provide "an adequate explanation of the casualty loss claimed on your return."

He added:

"Remember, the purpose of an adequate explanation is to enable the auditor to evaluate the reasonableness of the loss claimed without having to audit your return. Therefore, it is to your advantage to include in your return all the important information concerning the loss."

Other State income tax officials attending were: J. W. Brown, Baton Rouge, chief administrative assistant for individual taxes; Harold Couvillion, Baton Rouge, reviewing auditor, and Wilson Barrett, auditor in the New Orleans office.

AWARDS GIVEN

At the conclusion of the stage presentation, Usry presented certificates of meritorious public service to both newspapers for sponsoring the institute. The certificates were signed by IRS Commissioner Sheldon S.

Cohen. Poe accepted for the Times-Picayune; and Walter Cowan, managing editor of the States-Item, accepted for his newspaper.

Persons attending were then invited to address personal questions concerning their individual tax problems and Betsy losses to IRS agents, who were positioned at 17 tables in front of the stage. Three other tables staffed by Federal and State tax personnel, were also available.

The packages distributed to persons attending the institute contained "Hurricane Betsy Losses and Your Income Tax," a reprint of the 10-part series which appeared in the Times-Picayune; copies of the special sheets prepared by the IRS to aid hurricane victims in listing their losses; copies of Form 1040, the U.S. individual income tax return; a copy of the booklet, "Disaster, Casualties, and Thefts: How the Federal Income Tax Applies"; instructions for filing Form 1040 for 1965, as well as copies of the 1965 Louisiana Income Tax Return and a special sheet to submit with State returns for claiming losses.

ADDRESS BY HON. HALE BOGGS, DEMOCRAT, OF LOUISIANA, ON WAR IN VIETNAM TO THE PRESS CLUB OF NEW ORLEANS, DECEMBER 20, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, during the recess between sessions of the 89th Congress, I traveled to southeast Asia to see firsthand the U.S. effort in South Vietnam and to assess our trade policies in other countries in that area.

Upon my return I reported my findings in a speech to the Press Club of New Orleans and I would like to offer this report to my colleagues.

I would also like to report that reaction to the speech was very favorable, and through communications and conversation with my constituents in the Second District of Louisiana, I have found overwhelming support of U.S. policy in southeast Asia.

Here are my remarks:

ADDRESS BY HON. HALE BOGGS, DEMOCRAT, OF LOUISIANA, ON WAR IN VIETNAM TO THE PRESS CLUB OF NEW ORLEANS, DECEMBER 20, 1965

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I have just now returned from a trip which has taken me halfway around the world, and from the Northern to the Southern Hemisphere. I have been in New Zealand, Australia, Vietnam, Hong Kong, and Japan.

I wanted especially to go to Vietnam. As the war has quickened and as more Americans have become involved, I felt it essential, if I were to make intelligent determinations in the Congress on the issues involved, to go there and talk with our people and the Vietnamese people.

I felt it would be best, however, to go first to other countries closely associated with Asia, and also directly in the path of the Chinese Communists' thrust for world conquest.

Happily, I was able to combine these two missions. As you know, for years I have served as chairman of the Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee of the Joint House-

Senate Economic Committee. In this capacity, I have helped to write many of our trade and tariff bills, and I have worked as hard as I know how to expand trade and commerce through our own port here in New Orleans.

I also wanted to look at the problems and promises of trade between these countries and our own, and I wanted more particularly to stress the advantages of our own home port. In each country I met with the top people, both in and out of Government, and today, briefly, I would like to report to you some of my observations.

New Zealand is a long way. From Washington to Wellington, its capital city, is not only halfway around the world, but it also means a complete change of seasons. I was there in their late spring, and one of the days there was bright and sunny and the beaches were crowded with bathers. Christmas is very different from ours in that the people go to the countryside and the beaches, and do very much like we do on the Fourth of July.

New Zealand is an agricultural country. It produces lamb, wool, and beef—all for export. It is vitally concerned with such problems as the impact upon their trade by the possible entry of Great Britain into the Common Market. It is vitally concerned with our own import and export policies, and very much concerned with the measures we have adopted to prevent export of investment funds because of the unfavorable balance of payments existing there.

With these preoccupations, one would think that Vietnam would not be a matter of grave concern to these people—but this is not the case. They now thoroughly understand what would happen to them should we withdraw from Vietnam.

And even greater understanding exists in Australia, a country which has stood with us in World War I, World War II and the Korean war. Australia is a land mass almost the size of the continental United States. It has been described as the world's largest island and smallest continent. Throughout this vast area only 11 million people reside, and immediately above that continent lies Indonesia with the heaviest concentration of population on earth. From Indonesia to the southeast Asian peninsula and Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos is an easy jump. So Australia is acutely aware of Vietnam; acutely aware of the stakes involved.

Then I went to Hong Kong, the incredible city which has grown in 15 years from 500,000 people to 4 million people. There is a city that trades with the whole world, and is part of the mainland of Communist China. Practically all of the food consumed by the 4 million people who live in Hong Kong comes from the mainland. Why does Hong Kong exist, people ask. The answer is not difficult to come by. It is to Red China's advantage to allow Hong Kong to operate as a free and separate entity, because through this great port is generated most of the hard currency which the Communist Chinese use to purchase essentials from the outside world for their economy.

But most of all, Hong Kong is a listening post. The intelligence agents of all nations move in and out of the area.

What does one learn in Hong Kong? Several things, I think. One, that the split between Russia and China is a very real one, having an impact on every Communist Party on earth, and vitally affecting decisions which may ultimately determine whether or not world war III is avoided. One soon discovers that the very old leaders of Communist China—the average age of the 17 men who make up the top leadership is 68—face many problems of their own, the main one being what the Communists call revisionism, namely the tendency to forsake militant revolution for internal development, using some of the same incentives employed by free enterprise societies outside the Communist orbit.

So having gone to these places, I went to Vietnam. I was there several days. I talked to our Ambassador, to our military leaders, to our soldiers. I visited hospitals, the countryside. I did everything possible to find out all that I could about all that is going on there. One can only get impressions and one hopes that they are valid ones.

Let me say that I have no advice to give to the military. I have complete confidence in General Westmoreland and the other splendid officers who make up our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps leadership in that part of the world.

They have now, and will continue to have, my full support.

Now for some observations. First, we must stay in Vietnam until a just and lasting peace is obtained. Why? Because it is a crucial test between our country and Communist China, and its outcome may well determine whether we ultimately fight world war III or not. Communist China believes that it must conquer the world. It believes that it can do this through so-called wars of "national liberation." Here in the dense jungles and broad deltas of the tropics, every method of terror and coercion has been employed to bring about the success of this so-called war of "national liberation." Why is the Vietcong strong? Because the methods of terror and assassination remove the energetic adult leaders and force the young men from the villages and countryside into the Vietcong.

If we leave without a just peace, then the word is out that the West has lost and communism has won. The impact of this is quite obvious to any thoughtful person. Suffice it to say that Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, Indonesia, Pakistan, India, would fall very quickly. The chances are that when the Philippines come under the gun, we would then be in an all-out world war III. These are the simple, basic reasons for being in Vietnam.

Some argue that Vietnam is so far away, and is so insignificant that its conquest by Hanoi and Peiping presents no problem of such magnitude as to justify the present escalation of our military efforts.

Let us examine this for just a moment. In 1931, you may recall, the then Secretary of State, Henry L. Stimson, urged President Hoover and the British Government to confront the Japanese when that nation committed aggression against Manchuria. Mr. Stimson was not heeded, and Manchuria led on ultimately to Pearl Harbor and the chain of aggression was not broken until many Americans had lost their lives on islands that most of us had never heard of. There are many similar events of the recent past which might be cited, the failure of the League of Nations, Mussolini's conquest of Ethiopia, Hitler's defiance of treaty obligations, his seizure of one country after another, and ultimately the blood and sweat and the death and destruction of World War II.

So the notion that we can secure a quick peace by ignoring and forgetting about Vietnam is something that all of recent history tells us is wrong. And our Communist adversaries themselves have made it quite clear peace would not come with the sacrifice of the people of South Vietnam. Already they are talking about "national liberation" of Thailand. Thailand has never been a colonial nation. From whom would it be liberated? Not from us, or the British, or the French, but from the Thais.

And if we left, does any sensible person believe that the balance of power in the world would remain as it is now? Does anyone believe that Berlin would be secure, or that Communist terror would not be promoted throughout Asia and Africa and Latin America?

In a remarkable interview a few days ago, Ho Chi Minh, the leader of North Vietnam, rejected any notion of negotiation other than

by way of total surrender on the part of our people.

I have been in Japan. Their laborious effort has been quite successful in creating a peaceful and a democratic society. Its economy and industry are now harnessed to the ways of peace. After being in Japan, I am convinced that it could not continue this course, if we, in effect, surrender in Vietnam and withdraw from southeast Asia. One other important consideration arose time and time again in my discussions in Vietnam, Japan, and elsewhere, and that is that the split between the communism of China and the communism of Russia is very real indeed. If we withdraw, there can be no doubt that the Chinese brand of communism, that repeatedly and explicitly says it wants no peace, shall become dominant. That is why negotiation on the terms laid down by Hanoi and Peking would, in my opinion, visit a holocaust upon the world rather than bringing lasting peace.

Is there an easy way out? Is there a simple solution? The answer is "No." Imagine if you will the United States with half of the cities and towns under Communist control. Imagine no road or railroad or canal or river safe for communication and transportation. Imagine the farmer unable to produce his crop because of terror, murder and assassination, and imagine a terrain of jungles and swamps largely inaccessible, and you get some notion of the problems in Vietnam. Add to this fact that most of the leadership—the mayors, the councilmen, the educators, the editors, the physicians, the lawyers, and engineers have been assassinated. It is under these conditions that we seek to join with the forces of the South Vietnam Government to pacify the Communist-occupied areas of South Vietnam. This is why our military leaders don't claim victory. They say we have stopped "losing."

Six months ago, village after village was being surrounded and overcome, and the Government forces had retreated to the town squares and to the city of Saigon. Today, many of the villages have been retaken from the Viet Cong terrorists. More than that, the people know that we are there and we intend to stay. The impact of this is one of enormous significance.

Now, about our own men. Our forces are extremely able, tough, alert, and intelligent. Most of the men in our forces today are high school graduates; most of our officers are college graduates. Most of them are trained in government, in economics, and political systems; and most of them, thank God, understand the philosophical and political threat of communism so that they know what the war is about. The morale of our men is tremendous. Inspiring is the only word to describe it.

What has been the impact on them of so-called peace demonstrations here at home? All of the soldiers to whom I spoke understood that the demonstrations were the work of small minorities, or were promoted by Communist agitators. None were deceived into believing that they represented any major opinion in our country.

In some ways the effect has been quite opposite from that intended—in that literally millions of Americans have written to our forces in Vietnam expressing support. I presented petitions of support from about 7,000 citizens, gathered by the Americanism Committee of the Chamber of Commerce of the New Orleans area, and from about 3,500 students, staff, and faculty members of Tulane University. These expressions of support from our own area are being duplicated throughout the Nation, and are enormously encouraging to our forces.

There is no doubt that our military effort in Vietnam is vital to the ultimate success of the South Vietnamese people in achieving a stable, viable government under a free society. But the fact is that military suc-

cess in defeating the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese Army is one aspect in a long, arduous task of rebuilding the South Vietnamese society to meet the challenges and responsibilities of self-government as a modern state. One of the toughest aspects of our job in Vietnam—in terms of the long haul—is succeeding with our economic and social programs there.

Today more than 1,000 employees of the Agency for International Development—many of them working in the countryside and the small hamlets and villages—are engaged in helping the South Vietnamese people in the fields of agriculture, health, education, public works, public safety, public administration, labor industrial development, and various provincial operations such as resettlement of refugees, rehabilitation of Vietcong prisoners and others. Our Government is now providing more than \$300 million a year for our technical personnel to work with the South Vietnamese in these important areas. This economic assistance is a four-point effort in four major areas:

1. Grant aid: To finance imports to help maintain the South Vietnam economy on a day-to-day basis, and to prevent serious inflation, and curb the balance-of-payments deficit.

2. Capital projects assistance: To broaden the economic base and improve urban facilities with water supply systems, electrification, improved harbors, roads, and transport facilities.

3. Technical assistance: To improve human skills through education in agricultural methods, public health, public safety, public works, public administration, logistics, and other areas.

4. Counterinsurgency: To maintain basic services for the people by providing foodstuffs, farm tools, roofing, and cement and other things. Included in this part of the aid program is strengthening of the national police.

What are the prospects for immediate victory? Victory in this instance is not like that of a conventional war in that it must mean the containment of militant communism. This will undoubtedly take time and effort and sacrifice. But the stakes are enormous and the price is worth our best efforts. I don't mean to be pessimistic. The fact that we have taken a stand there has already had tremendous repercussions throughout Asia, Africa, and more particularly in Indonesia, where the Communists have now been denied victory.

I recall as vividly as any experience of my life, the days of the Cuban crisis. You may remember that Congress had just adjourned and President Kennedy summoned all of the congressional leaders back to Washington. There in the Cabinet Room of the White House he outlined in detail the Russian missile threat to the United States. For one momentous week the Nation looked down the nuclear barrel. On the Monday after the Sunday morning that Khrushchev wrote his letter to the President indicating withdrawal of the missiles, President Kennedy said, at his final briefing, "The military threat of Russia is receding. Now the threat will come from Communist China as it develops the hydrogen bomb."

Two years later, almost to the day, gathered in the same room, almost the same people, with the exception of President Kennedy. President Johnson briefed us on the explosion of the first nuclear device in China. There were many questions directed at Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara. The principal one was, What threat does this pose to the free world? The answer came back—very little as of now, but a major and dangerous one 10 years from now, barring no change in the aggressive government now dominant in China.

And as I talked with our leaders in Vietnam and Saigon, these meetings kept re-

curring in my mind. So this is the ultimate challenge of Vietnam. Whether we turn back the threat now or whether we repeat the events of other days and ultimately face a China infinitely stronger than it is today, determined to conquer the rest of mankind. In essence, our success in containing communism in south Vietnam may well determine whether or not our country and the free world will be forced to fight world war III.

Our men in Vietnam understand this and they are willing to make the sacrifices required to prevent this from happening.

This is what all of our people at home must understand. This is what the so-called demonstrators, unless they be Communist motivated, do not understand. And this is the message that I bring back from that far-off place where Americans are fighting to preserve your freedom and mine.

In conclusion, let me quote from the address made by President Johnson at the Johns Hopkins University in April 1965:

"We fight because we must fight if we are to live in a world where every country can shape its own destiny. And only in such a world will our own freedom be finally secure. * * *

"The first reality is that North Vietnam has attacked the independent nation of South Vietnam. Its object is total conquest. * * *

"Over this war, and all Asia, is another reality: the deepening shadow of Communist China. The rulers in Hanoi are urged on by Peking. This is a regime which has destroyed freedom in Tibet, attacked India, and been condemned by the United Nations for aggression in Korea. It is a nation which is helping the forces of violence in almost every continent. * * *

"Why are we in South Vietnam? * * *

"We are there because we have a promise to keep. Since 1954 every American President has offered support to the people of South Vietnam. We have helped to build, and we have helped to defend. Thus, over the years, we have made a national pledge to help South Vietnam defend its independence. And I intend to keep that promise.

"We are also there to strengthen world order. To leave Vietnam to its fate would shake the confidence of all these people in the value of American commitment, the value of America's word. The result would be increased unrest and instability, and even wider war.

"We are there because there are great stakes in the balance. Let no one think for a moment that retreat from Vietnam would bring an end to the conflict. The battle would be renewed in one country and then another. The central lesson of our time is that the appetite of aggression is never satisfied.

"There are those who wonder why we have a responsibility there. We have it for the same reason we have a responsibility for the defense of the freedom of Europe. World War II was fought in both Europe and Asia, and when it ended, we found ourselves with continued responsibility for the defense of freedom.

"Our objective is the independence of South Vietnam, and its freedom from attack. We want nothing for ourselves, only that the people of South Vietnam be allowed to guide their own country in their own way.

"It should also be clear that the only path for reasonable men is the path of peaceful settlement.

"Such peace demands an independent South Vietnam securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationships to all others, free from outside interference, tied to no alliance, a military base for no other country."

Mr. Speaker, since my speech was delivered, our Government has undertaken

by every honorable means a monumental effort to bring about the kind of just peace described in the last paragraph quoted above. For the sake of all mankind, the whole world hopes for success despite the fact that it has now been conclusively shown that the leaders in Hanoi desire to continue aggression.

NARCOTICS ADDICTION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation, four bills in total, which must occupy a position of absolute priority on the congressional agenda of 1966.

The problem is narcotics addiction. The need is for a more humane and effective Federal approach to that grave reality. The focus must be an attempt to differentiate the sickness of narcotics use from the crime of narcotics distribution, and in such cases to substitute rehabilitation for pure punishment.

The bills I am introducing today are intended to make it possible for the Federal Government to make such distinctions in narcotics cases. Each is designed to allow a more flexible response to what is finally an immensely complicated psychological, medical, and social reality. Two of the measures attempt to modernize procedures for the prosecution and punishment of narcotics crimes. Two seek to promote a new Federal commitment to research, treatment, and rehabilitative services and facilities for addicts. The bills are complementary.

A more enlightened narcotics policy requires initially that diseased addicts be withdrawn from the category of simple criminals. Accordingly, one of my bills would authorize the pretrial civil commitment of addicts for medical treatment and probationary care—in lieu of criminal prosecution. My own State of New York has been a pioneer in providing civil commitment for addicts. The bill I today introduce attempts to write such procedure into Federal law. Persons accused of narcotics crimes would be allowed the option of undertaking a compulsory treatment and rehabilitation program, rather than standing trial for offenses presently designated as crimes, but usually the simple expression of their narcotics disease.

Safeguards are built into this approach. The civil commitment program would not be open to persons charged with stealing narcotics for resale, nor would it be available to criminals convicted of two or more felonies, nor to those with a prior pending felony charge. Persons who had previously participated in civil commitment programs on two or more occasions would also be prohibited from further participation. These safeguards are necessary, though it is my own view that all narcotics criminals must

eventually be given open rehabilitation opportunities.

My second bill seeks to move in that direction. Our first goal, however, must be treatment of the young addict, the first offender, and those most vulnerable to the criminal trade of dope distribution. We must try to break the vicious circle of addiction, imprisonment, release, and renewed addiction.

The second bill seeks certain reforms in existing narcotics criminal law. The operating principle is to be prosecutorial discretion in enforcing narcotics laws in order to provide incentive for addicts convicted of Federal crimes to pursue treatment while in confinement. If adopted this legislation would allow Federal courts to use probation, parole, and suspended sentences as tools to promote the rehabilitation of the addict-criminal. Changes envisaged would allow judges to determine whether an accused is a major peddler of narcotics, and should be tried under the most stringent provisions of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, or is a simple addict arrested for possession alone and deserving of less punitive treatment. The principal intention of this provision is to provide, within the structure of the law, clear incentives for narcotics addicts to avoid narcotics peddling, and to seek rehabilitation while in custody. The bill also provides some flexible sentencing provisions for the Federal Youth Corrections Act.

I believe the approach in this provision is not inconsistent with vigilance against illegal narcotics traffic. There are many ways to eliminate that traffic—one, I believe, is to take as many young and first offending addicts out of the stream. Prosecutorial discretion in narcotics cases is a means to that end.

A commitment to greater use of rehabilitative services in narcotics will not be possible unless the Federal Government can initiate a new program for construction and funding of treatment facilities. The third bill I introduce today, consequently, provides \$25 million a year for a 3-year program of aid for new services and research projects.

A formula of two-thirds, one-third Federal-State matching grants will control the appropriation of 80 percent of the grants. The remaining 20 percent will be given as a direct 100-percent grant to nonprofit private organizations with little capital of their own. Equally important in this measure, I believe, are the provisions to encourage new people to enter the narcotics rehabilitation field. Vocational training would be expanded with use of funds authorized by the legislation.

Let me say then that I would hope programs in rehabilitation would make a special attempt to utilize cured addicts or rehabilitated criminals, or even poor people in the services. The reality of narcotics addiction is unique. Those who have shared the experience of victimization, and those who have found the skill to overcome oppressive conditions are best equipped to help their fellows.

The fourth bill in the program I am submitting provides aid for the construction and acquisition of treatment facilities.

ties. Its formula is essentially similar to that in the third bill, dealing with rehabilitation services. It authorizes expenditures of \$50 million a year for 2 years.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me once again express my conviction that narcotics legislation must receive attention during this session of Congress. Under President Johnson's skilled leadership, the country is beginning to grow aware of the invisible poor and exploited amidst us. I suggest that the plight of no citizen in this country is as tortured and agonized as that of the narcotics addict. To cure a social problem, we must first properly identify it. As much as anything, the bills I am today introducing seek to establish a new definition and approach to narcotics problems. Only when this is achieved will we have any grounds for hope that the terrible fact of addiction can be eliminated.

U.S. FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR REX M. WHITTON

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the International Road Federation is one of the outstanding worldwide organizations active in the field of highway transportation. This organization publishes monthly a paper known as World Highways, which has extensive circulation in all sections of the globe. I am happy to note that in the January 1966, issue, there is a long article paying proper tribute to an old friend of mine, the U.S. Federal Highway Administrator Rex M. Whitton.

I have known Rex since he was the chief highway engineer for the State of Missouri. I worked closely with him in those days, and even more so since he assumed the most important role of Administrator of our vast highway program. Under Mr. Whitton's guidance the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, which authorized the construction of our great highway system, has been properly implemented and the results can be seen today in the vast new roads that crisscross all sections of our land.

I am privileged and proud to have the opportunity to place into the Record this tribute to a most distinguished public servant, Rex M. Whitton.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article from the January 1966, issue of World Highways:

PERSONALITY PROFILE: U.S. FEDERAL ADMINISTRATOR OVERSEES REVOLUTIONARY HIGHWAY PROGRAM

U.S. Federal Highway Administrator Rex M. Whitton has headed the Bureau of Public Roads during the most momentous period in the history of the U.S. Federal-State highway program.

Now rounding out his 5th year as the top U.S. highway official, he has probably overseen more revolutionary developments in the program than occurred during the previous

45 years of the Bureau of Public Roads-State highway department roadbuilding partnership.

Mr. Whitton took office as Federal Highway Administrator on February 10, 1961, under the late President John F. Kennedy, bringing with him the benefit of more than 40 years experience with the Missouri State Highway Commission, nearly 10 of them as its chief engineer. He applied his energies to advancing the top-priority work on the 41,000-mile (66,000-kilometer) National System of Interstate Highways while at the same time accelerating construction and reconstruction of other elements of the U.S. road network.

When he assumed direction of the Bureau of Public Roads there were about 10,000 miles (16,100 kilometers) of the Interstate System in use, including more than 2,000 miles of existing roads that had been incorporated into the system. Today half the 41,000 miles (66,000 kilometers) is in operation, another 6,000 miles (9,700 kilometers) are under construction, and comparable progress has been made on the other Federal-aid road programs.

But Mr. Whitton's impact on the total U.S. highway effort has principally been felt in adjusting it to new conditions and challenges both at home and abroad. Shortly after he took office he began reorganizing the Bureau to devote increased attention and talent to the specialized fields of planning, research and development, and highway safety.

PLANNING R. & D. SAFETY

Under Mr. Whitton's direction, the Bureau has been pursuing an intensified nationwide effort to foster planning in all U.S. cities. The planning itself is a State and community responsibility, but the Bureau is offering financial assistance, advice, and encouragement.

The Bureau and the States also have undertaken broad studies of U.S. highway needs after 1972, when the present huge program is scheduled to expire or taper off.

In urban transportation research the Bureau has stepped up efforts to improve methods of predicting and planning for future needs and is working on improved electronic-control systems for more efficient use of available street capacity. It has recently made Federal funds available to the States in much greater amounts for such purposes.

Research and development in highway location, design, and construction have been varied and productive and the future promises far more positive results. The use of aerial-survey techniques, coupled with the computer, has been notable; nuclear, sonic, and other nondestructive testing devices have been developed; and roadbuilding machinery is becoming automated.

Mr. Whitton has established an Office of Highway Safety in the Bureau that deals with the problem of traffic accidents—their causes and a means of reducing road deaths and injuries. He instituted a spot-improvement program to eliminate hazards at highway locations with high accident records. The Bureau is also exploring information and guidance systems involving electronic detectors, communications, computers, and other similar devices that will aid drivers.

During the 1st session of the 89th Congress, just ended, a law was enacted that may have far-reaching effects on halting the rising trend of auto deaths and accidents. It directs that after December 31, 1967, each State should have a comprehensive highway-safety program approved by the U.S. Secretary of Commerce.

ETHICS AND ESTHETICS

Any list of Mr. Whitton's contributions to highway progress in the United States must include the adoption and promotion of human and moral values in the road program. In 1962, for example, financial assistance to families and businesses displaced by

Federal-aid road construction was made possible for the first time. Until then relatively few States made any payments for moving costs. Now the Federal Government reimburses States for an appropriate share of moving costs paid by an individual, a family, a business, farm, or nonprofit organization.

He has long been an advocate of esthetic design of highways themselves and of preventing unsightly encroachments on the adjacent countryside. He took an active part in promoting President Johnson's highway beautification program, which became law on October 22, 1965.

"The people who build highways know that what they build will last for years," Whitton has said. "They know that how they build will have a deep influence on the areas they serve. They know that highways are the windows to the beauty and grandeur of America."

"The people who build highways want to build with beauty. They want to preserve and enhance our natural and man-made heritage. They want to serve the spiritual as well as the physical needs of our Nation."

AN INTERNATIONALIST

Mr. Whitton has taken a more active role in international road matters than any of his predecessors and his leadership has projected the Bureau's activities further into world transport problems and attempts at solutions. He has attended virtually all of the international highway and traffic engineering conferences during his term of office. He was a principal speaker at the Fourth IRF World Meeting in Madrid in 1962, at the IRF Regional Conferences in Tokyo in 1964 and Lima in 1965, at the Ninth Pan American Highway Congress in Washington in 1963, and at many other similar meetings.

"We in the United States claim no special fountain of knowledge," he told the Lima meeting in May of this year. "When it comes to technical theory and practice, we have received knowledge from the experts of other nations, just as we have given it."

"I think all of us come eagerly to conferences such as this, to exchange ideas and information, and at once to learn and to teach one another. For it is thus that we build better roads—which build better communities, regions, and nations—and a better world."

In addition to assistance to six Central American countries in the building of the Pan American Highway, the Bureau of Public Roads also participated during fiscal 1964-65 in road-improvement programs in the 13 countries of Bolivia, Brazil, Cambodia, Iran, Jordan, Laos, Nepal, Peru, the Philippines, Spain, Sudan, Turkey, and Yemen. Other types of assistance were given to Burundi, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, and Togo.

The Bureau, under Mr. Whitton's leadership, is cooperating with IRF in a worldwide survey of research and development in the highway and highway-transport field. The total project will make available the results of road research around the world to all who request them. With the pilot project finished, the program has been extended during the current year to 17 countries within the Americas, Europe, and Asia.

HONORED AMONG MEN

A native of Missouri, Mr. Whitton has spent his entire working life advancing highway research, development, and construction. He has received virtually all available honors in the highway field of the United States. He served as president of the American Association of State Highway Officials (AASHO) in 1956. He is a past chairman and presently a member of the Executive Committee of the Highway Research Board (HRB).

In 1958 he received the George S. Bartlett Award for outstanding service to high-

way progress in the United States. He was voted one of the "Top 10 Public Works Men of the Year" by the American Public Works Association in 1960, and in the same year he was the recipient of the Thomas H. MacDonald Award for continuous outstanding service in the highway-engineering field.

At a time of life when most public officials have gone into retirement Mr. Whitton has set an energetic pace for his colleagues of the Bureau and of the highway program generally. He has been widely praised by high Government officials, Members of Congress and other U.S. leaders, not only for his contributions to the highway effort, but also for his enthusiasm and bristling energy.

His present superior, Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor, probably summed up the consensus of opinion when he pointed out that Mr. Whitton leads and executes a road and road-transport program almost as large as that of the rest of the world combined.

"In carrying out this vast undertaking he has proven to be an efficient and effective executive and engineer whose integrity is consistent with the highest public ethics," the Secretary said. "His monuments are the thousands and thousands of miles of roads here in the United States which reflect his more than 45 years of service in land communications."

WATER POLLUTION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced two bills to encourage States and private business concerns to take immediate and effective action to overcome the menace of water pollution. This legislation is fully in keeping with past congressional action in this area, and I urge all my colleagues who are concerned with this problem to lend their support to these efforts.

Last year, I was privileged to be in the forefront of legislative efforts which established the framework within which the Federal Government would assist in the abatement of water pollution. We set up a new Water Pollution Control Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and provided funds to help the States develop improved methods of controlling water pollution, and to assist the States on a matching basis in the construction of community sewage treatment plants. The bills I have introduced today would further this effort by increasing by \$100 million the amounts to be made available to the States, and by providing a tax benefit to private concerns which meet their social responsibilities by constructing waste treatment facilities.

Prior to the enactment of Public Law 89-234, the Congress had made available to the States, \$100 million a year in Federal matching grants for the construction of community sewage treatment plants. This amount was allocable on the dual basis of population and per capita income, and with respect to those funds that basis still obtains. In addition, grants had been limited to 30 percent of construction costs, or \$1 million whichever was less, but the Federal contribution could be as high as \$4 million if a joint project involving many communities were involved.

During the last session this authorization was increased to \$150 million, with the additional \$50 million distributable on the basis of population alone. Also, the limits of \$1 million and \$4 million were increased to \$1.2 and \$4.8 million respectively. Because this authorization has proven to be totally inadequate, one of the bills I introduced today would further increase authorized matching grants to \$250 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. Moreover, this additional \$100 million will be distributable on the basis of population alone, and will not be subject to the per-project limit of \$1.2 or \$4.8 million.

This distribution formula is designed to provide a relatively larger share of Federal assistance to States with larger populations which have a demonstrably greater need for sewage treatment plants. The direct relationship between population concentration and water pollution has been amply demonstrated, so I believe that this formula for the distribution of the additional \$100 million is certainly a fair one.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the States have shown their serious concern for the need to take action to curb water pollution. I am particularly proud that on last election day, my fellow New Yorkers overwhelmingly approved the total commitment to rid our State of water pollution, by adopting a \$1 billion bond issue. Half of this figure will go to municipalities in the form of State grants; while the other half will be used to prefinance the Federal Government's full 30-percent share as necessary.

One of the bills I introduced this afternoon would enable the State to set about implementing its programs immediately by authorizing reimbursement to New York of the full Federal share of the costs of eligible construction projects. While this authorization is necessary, it is by no means a departure from established congressional policy, for similar authority exists with respect to Federal-State highway construction projects.

Another measure I introduced is designed to encourage private concerns to join in the undertaking to combat water pollution, by providing a tax benefit for any taxpayer who constructs a new waste treatment facility, the construction or installation of which is completed after the enactment of the bill. This benefit consists in permission to depreciate the entire cost of construction, or as much thereof as the taxpayer desires, within the first year.

Last year we enacted effective air pollution legislation and in so doing brought forth a national response to a problem which was national in scope. Water pollution represents a similar threat to health and a drain on our economic resources, and calls for comparable effective action at the Federal level. The need for clean waters has become more urgent with each passing year; the water shortage has become more critical, and the residents of our metropolitan areas need and deserve more opportunities for healthful recreation. Only an all-out effort of this kind can succeed in making our waters safe for drinking, swimming,

and fishing. I believe that my legislation will provide the all-out effort we need.

COST OF LIVING ON THE INCREASE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the greatest hazard which every American and every American family faces has scarcely been mentioned here today. This is inflation which is reflected in the rising cost of living and in the reduced buying power of the dollar.

The truth is that this administration is giving with one hand and taking away with the other. Inflation is a thief which, as other speakers will show, hurts the needy most in its robbery. They will also emphasize that inflation is the cruelest form of taxation.

Thus while the administration seeks wildly to push money into one pocket of the needy, it is extracting that money from the other pocket. If the power to tax is the power to destroy, inflation is the secret taxation which can destroy the prosperity of every American man, woman, and child. As we will show, it is already hurting them. As a matter of fact, inflation is really the imposition of a national sales tax on every man, woman, and child who uses his or her dollars to buy goods and services.

Inflation is growing. The cost of living rose by about 2 percent in 1965. One of our speakers will tell just what that means to every American.

And inflation is the great untalked about national problem. Today we propose to talk about it and to show that its acceleration stems from present wild spending and growing administration deficits.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, there is no greater thief than inflation. There is no more evil thief than inflation because the poor and the aged suffer more from it.

An increase in the cost of living hits the poor hardest because they can least afford to pay. It next hits those who, with hard work and prudence, have provided for old age because it cuts the buying power of the dollar they have saved.

Now, in 1965, the cost of living increased about 2 percent. If it were to increase at that rate for 20 years, \$1 in every \$3 saved will simply vanish. It will have been plucked from your pocket and your neighbors' by the politicians of administration ilk who advocate wild spending and unsound fiscal policies.

I would recall to you that, in the Truman era, the rising cost of living outran the spiral of wage increases. We are apt to forget. But let us not forget that inflation such as this administration is inducing by wild spending is a thief that

robs most from the poor and the aged—but robs from us all.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry but I have here a report that because of our wild spending policies, the Government bonds our people have been buying in good faith are dropping in real value.

I note that Gordon C. Murray, writing in the San Diego Evening Tribune, states that a citizen who bought a "safe" Government bond 10 years ago would take a beating if he sold it today. He reveals:

When issued on February 15, 1955, this bond cost \$1,000 and paid 3-percent interest. At maturity February 15, 1995, the Government will redeem it at its full face value.

But right now—according to a price listed in the Wall Street Journal of December 23, 1965—the bond is worth only \$831.40. This means that an original purchaser who for some reason must sell at this time loses money. Not only has he lost \$168.60 of his original cost, but he has also lost \$15 on the average for each of the almost 11 years he has held the bond, because he could have made up to 4½ percent—\$45 instead of \$30 annually—in some other type of conservative investment.

Furthermore, the \$831.40 remaining has been subject to the inroads of inflation at the rate of over 1 percent per year.

Mr. Speaker, according to this report, those who advocate and support wild and uncontrolled spending are robbing people who invest in good faith in the bonds of our Government which have been in the past, and should be, utterly safe.

Inflation is the cruelest and most cowardly form of taxation.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, the buying power of the dollar is being drastically reduced by wild spending, and there has been no spending wilder than the way the administration has tossed about the funds voted by Congress to help the poor.

For instance, we have just learned that four Job Corps trainees won an all-expense tour to the Rose Bowl game. It seems they were selected for "their prowess in punting, place-kicking, passing, and running the 50-yard dash, as well as for writing an essay 'What the Job Corps Means to Me.'"

When I read this announcement, I asked a reporter to check on OEO press releases for me. I found that in 18 recent days, the taxpayer had footed the cost for 72 press releases—and what press releases. They were all on one side of slick paper. They were not mimeographed. They were expensive photo offset jobs.

In 1 day, 31 of these releases were issued by the Poverty Administration in

Washington. Know what? Each was sent in a separate envelope.

I note that in a grant for Monmouth County, N.J., \$52,000 of \$67,000 was earmarked for administrative salaries and expenses.

But those press releases showed me why the OEO needs all those \$50 consultants, to lick stamps.

Not only do the poor need to be protected from the poverty administrators. This tossing around of our dollars decreases their value. When a person hands us a bad check we call him a crook. What do you call an administration that hands out shrinking dollars?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, if the wild throwing away of our taxpayers' money by this administration continues unchecked, the dollar that each employee and each employer puts into social security funds will be worth only two-thirds what it is now worth in buying power as it is paid.

This is based upon last year's increase in the cost of living. But as the deficit grows—and we are told it is going to be much bigger in billions in fiscal 1967 than it was in fiscal 1966—so will the cost of living inevitably go up. This is a fact of import to each citizen because it means an acceleration of inflation and an even faster drop in the buying power of the dollar.

According to official U.S. figures today's dollar is worth 38-plus cents of a 1940 dollar which, in turn, was worth only 69 cents of a 1930 Republican dollar.

Big spending—and resulting inflation—robs those paying in for a pension in their old age, or paying for unemployment insurance to take care of them in bad times. I say: Watch those who are spending your money so wildly.

When a foreign government does it, we call it dangerous inflation. When this administration does it, it is called economic statesmanship.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, when inflation and wild spending, its primal cause, are discussed, one cannot avoid the money tossed away on foreign aid to those who have turned around and bitten the hand that fed them.

I call to the attention of the House in this connection a column in the New York Journal-American of October 8 by that veteran columnist, Walter Winchell, who said:

Now read this one and blow your tops: The following nations in 1963 got U.S. hand-outs and voted for Russia against the United States at the U.N.:

Afghanistan (\$235,800,000): It voted with the United States six times and for Russia

eight times. Algeria (\$94,600,000): Voted with us three times, with Russia nine times. Burma (\$117,100,000): Voted with us four times, against us eight. Cambodia (\$366,400,000): Voted four times with us and eight times with Russia. Ceylon (\$84,300,000): Voted six times with us, eight with the Reds. Ethiopia (\$201,600,000): Voted five times for our side and eight for Russia. Ghana (\$159,200,000): Voted six for us and eight against. India (\$4,692,900,000): Voted eight-eight. Iraq (\$68,300,000): Voted three-seven. Jordan (\$412,200,000): Voted three times for us and six against. Laos (\$328,400,000): Voted three-seven. Mali (\$1,900,000): Voted twice for us and nine times for Moscow. Syrian Arab Republic (\$83,500,000): Voted four-seven. Tunisia (\$355,200,000): Voted seven-eight. Uganda (\$12,100,000): Voted three times for us and seven for Nikita. United Arab Republic (\$802,400,000): The Nasser ingrates voted eight times for Russia and only three times for us. Yemen (\$29,000,000): It voted once for Americans and seven times for the So and Soviets.

Now I ask the Members to consider: Was this aid or blackmail? They are all back for more this year. I suggest it is time we start taking a hard look at these requests and ask, Are they in the interest of our Nation and the advancement of peace and freedom?

We are a nation that believes in doing good but not in being done wrong.

And the housewife, the laborer, the aged, and all of us are paying in decreased buying power of the dollar for these throwaways. This is the sort of senseless spending that causes inflation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the root causes of the accelerating inflation which has cut the purchasing power of the dollar by almost two-thirds since 1940 is the loss of our gold reserves.

The worldwide dollar crisis of the past 5 years has been caused in part by the Democratic administrations continuing to follow the theory of deficit financing. Today we have less than \$5 billion of gold to use for foreign payments, less than 2 years supply today when the dollar drain is running at the rate of \$3 billion a year.

Today it is within the power of foreign governments, with \$28 billion in short-term dollar balances, to break the dollar. Probably only the fact that foreign governments hold so many keeps them from doing this.

The wonder is not that the administration has substituted tokens for silver coins and removed the metal backing for the dollar. The wonder is that the administration does not move to balance the budget instead of resorting to marginal stopgap methods to improve our balance of trade such as harshly restricting American foreign investments.

Inflation is robbing the poor, the aged, and all of us. Is this administration incapable of making the United States again the free world's citadel of responsible public finance and solid currency?

JUAN T. TRIPPE—PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, last month it was my pleasure to be in New York at the time the annual awards were being made by the National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame. Many of the football greats of the past and present were in attendance. It was an evening I shall long remember.

You would naturally think, Mr. Speaker, that the main address would be delivered by an alltime, everybody's all-American. As it turned out, the highlight of the evening was contributed by Mr. Juan T. Trippe, chairman and chief executive officer of Pan American World Airways.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Trippe was hardly a Christy Flanagan, a Tom Harmon, a Pudge Heffelfinger or a Tuss McLaughry during his brief tenure on the Yale football squad. As a matter of fact, by his own admission, he was a guard on his freshman team.

However, there is more to the story than that. Juan Trippe neglects to mention that his brief career as a Yale line-man resulted from a severe back injury in an early scrimmage, a back injury which still plagues him periodically.

While, because of the injury, Juan Trippe did not join the immortals of the college game, he was still able to interrupt his education during World War I and become a Navy flier; and, later on, with some of his old combat and college colleagues to found the airline which is now Pan American World Airways.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting to add that on the night last month on which he delivered the principal address, Mr. Trippe's football and business associates thought well enough of his contributions to the game to award him the Football Foundation Gold Medal for 1965.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Trippe's remarks of last December 7 might well serve as an inspiration to other young college men who do not necessarily become all-Americans but who play the game. He has some serious and provoking thoughts; and under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I insert Mr. Trippe's talk as a part of the Record:

REMARKS BY JUAN T. TRIPPE, CHAIRMAN AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS, AT THE ANNUAL AWARDS DINNER OF THE NATIONAL FOOTBALL FOUNDATION AND HALL OF FAME, DECEMBER 7, 1965

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, may I first thank you for the signal honor you have conferred this evening. When the officers of the National Football Foundation informed me, several months ago, that I had been selected to receive this year's Gold Medal, I told them the Selection Committee must have gone "berserk." Some terrible mistake had been made which the committee should promptly correct. Now, as I look around this room, starred with all-Americans—as I see many old friends and football greats of my vintage—among them Ham Fish and Don Lurie, I am, more than ever convinced, your committee must have had a blackout even worse than we had here in

New York several weeks ago. What is a freshman guard, who, as our chairman just pointed out, never won his letter, to say about football in such a company as this?

I suppose the answer is obvious. I suppose what I can do is to undertake to speak for the people I really represent—for the rest of the freshman guards—for the rank and file of men and boys who have played football since the game began—the unsung thousands, who may or may not have won a varsity letter, who may or may not have eaten at training tables, who may or may not have heard their names at the end of a long cheer or even a short one, but who, nevertheless played their hearts out and came back to play some more.

And what shall I say on their behalf? What would they want me to say? That they are proud to be represented here, of course. But beyond that? Well, probably, that they are a little troubled—as they recall their old football days—and compare them with a bit of the so-called bigtime football they now often read and hear about. For we, of course, we old freshman guards, we of the rank and file, are men who “went out for the team” as the saying used to go—men who turned up at practice, with hundreds of others, and worked our way through the scrimmages and the first games and either made it or didn’t make it, but anyway offered ourselves: men who tried * * * who went out.

But is that what happens now? We don’t know. We wonder. We hear rumors on some campuses these days that going out for the team is as dead as Dink Stover. We hear stories about a young man at some university or other—the name changes each time the tale is told—who reported for practice when the season started, only to be met, not by a welcome, not even by a kind word, but only by incredulous astonishment not untouched by amusement. Didn’t he know that there was nothing to go out for? That the football team was already chosen? That it had been chosen for months? For a year maybe? Hadn’t anybody explained to him volunteers weren’t expected? That the place for eager students was in the stands?

And then too, there is another story we keep hearing—perhaps I should say the same story turned the other way around. One of the national news weeklies told it a couple of weeks ago. A great football coach at a well-known university is being asked about his latest triumphs, and here I quote: “Aw, shucks,” he says, “I’m not a great coach. I’m a good recruiter.” So he is asked about his recruiting practice, and he replies, “Our grants-in-aid are based on academic achievement and need. By academic achievement we mean the boy can read and write. By need—well, we don’t take a boy unless we need him.”

Now, we understand, of course, we old freshman guards, that football coaches have a right to a sense of humor, and this coach was probably jesting. Even so, such articles bother us—and bother us for football reasons. For what they imply, is simply and obviously, that the game of football is becoming a spectator’s game—so far as players like ourselves—the rank and file of football-loving students—are concerned.

Now we have nothing against spectator football, particularly when it is as exciting to watch as modern football has become. Compared with our old muddy struggles, the contemporary game is a delight, and the touchdown pass to the far corner is a far prettier thing from a high seat in the bowl than it ever was from the muck with your face in it. But the point is—that what we cared about, and what thousands of youngsters could still care about, is the game, as a game to play. We freshman guards and freshman tackles and all the rest didn’t love football because it looked exciting from 40 rows up. We loved football because it was exciting to be in. We liked the sense of com-

bat—of companionship in combat. We admired the courage football develops and the stubborn purpose it demands. We remember even now the conflict of bodies, the matching of wills, the moments of grace, the glimpses of physical brilliance, of spiritual ardor. We remember the triumphs. We remember too—and with gratitude for their revelations of human dignity and self-control—the defeats. All our lives, gentlemen, we remember these things. They were a strength to us, a resource, in the difficult moments when we needed strength. They still are.

Football, I suspect, has been the same for all of you—for the varsity stars and the all-Americans as well as for the rest of us. How many of you in this room have found yourselves remembering in some moment of apprehension, even of despair, the smell of kicked-up earth and the bitter taste of mud and lime on some field where once, long, long ago, you helped to stop the Harvards or Califormia or the Navy or Notre Dame, or whatever conquering team you had no chance to stop, and somehow did? How many of you, when you have found yourselves beginning to doubt the other fellow, perhaps even your coworker in the company—have cast your minds back to the unspoken and unquestioned loyalties of this game you used to play?

To any other audience than this, such questions would have a sentimental sound. It is no longer fashionable in our generation to talk of the playing fields of Eton when we think of the terrible Waterloos through which our age has had to live and fight. But with this audience, apologies and explanations are not necessary. You are here not because you love football as a spectacle—but because you love it as a game, and because you know what you owe that game. Because you know what the Nation owes it. And I am not thinking, nor will you be thinking, merely of the number of athletes it has contributed to the armed services, great as that contribution has been. I am thinking, as you are, of the qualities—the character, the courage, the resolve—which this game has developed in the minds and spirits of many of the Nation’s greatest leaders, not alone in the armed services, not alone on Capitol Hill, but throughout American industry and even in the White House.

All of us have our examples, our favorite stories, of this influence of football and I have mine. Mine has to do with the establishment, in the spring of 1941, a few months before Pearl Harbor, of a civil transport service across Africa just south of the Sahara Desert to support General Montgomery in his defense of Egypt against Rommel, the Desert Fox. We had discussions with Churchill and, a few days later, with Roosevelt. Both agreed that such a route was necessary and Pan Am were asked to undertake and rush the job of building a 4,000-mile airway from Bathurst to Khartoum and north to Cairo. Every hour counted. The machinery—earthmovers and the like—was made available by Mayor LaGuardia, right off the streets here in New York City. A vessel, tied up at a pier on the East River, was requisitioned to transport it. But where were the men to direct this brutal emergency job to come from—the job of building, under forced draft, an airway, including five airports, across Africa. Construction materials, fuel and supplies would have to be moved by jeep, truck, and camel—for there were few roads.

Well, gentlemen, they came as volunteers, a round dozen of them, from the Yale football team of the previous fall. The job was finished in 5 weeks. The mortar shells and tank ammunition were flown from West African ports to Montgomery’s army in Egypt—just before the crucial battle of El Alamein—for the Allied armies in Europe—the turning point of World War II. Air Marshal Portal, that great Britisher, is on

record—had the munitions not arrived—Montgomery was lost.

Now moral and spiritual and physical education of this kind does not come from occupying seats in football stadiums. It does not come from listening to the statistics of consecutive wins and losses. It does not even come from marching up and down between the halves with an trombone or a drum. It comes from playing football. And what troubles me—what troubles every man, I think, who really loves the game of football—is the present, all too obvious tendency to take the playing of the game of football away from the students themselves.

This is being done in various ways. One way is to abolish football. About 130 universities and colleges, including the University of Chicago where Alonzo Stagg turned out some of the greatest teams and some of the most remarkable men the game has known, took that ultimate step a generation ago.

But there is also another way of taking the game away from the students. When football is played, not by undergraduates who go out for the team, but by specialists recruited for the purpose, some of whom are not really students at all, football is just as certainly removed from the reach of the college community as if it had been abolished. Future professional players might profit from such a game, but not the rank and file of the college generation—the future businessmen, lawyers, statesmen, scientists, soldiers—the citizens of the Republic.

As a spectator sport, professional football today has hit the jackpot. Pro football is big business. A club franchise is worth \$10 million. Millions of people pay each fall to watch the pros. Fifty million more follow closely on television. Television rights are worth \$75 million. As a spectator sport, pro football now leads baseball. But while millions of people enjoy pro football as spectators, less than 1,000 play pro football. Playing the game is what really counts and pro football makes no contribution to playing the game.

A decade ago, we would have been told that the remedy lay in intramural football—with an intercollegiate slant—such as is played at Cambridge and New Haven. Few, I think, would say that now. Intramural games are sometimes badly played. Injuries persist. The intercollegiate twist at the season end does not help. The fact is that football—true football—is drama as well as sport. It demands dramatic settings—dramatic tension—precisely such a setting as the great games provide. All of us, however, now can see some progress in the development of the playing game. A dozen institutions which banned football altogether a generation ago, have seen the error of their ways. Today, undergraduate students at Fordham, New York University, Santa Clara, Chicago, and St. Mary’s are fortunate to be again playing football. Today, many scholar-athletes are playing great football. Many of them are all-American. Seven, seated here at the head table, are proof that Phi Beta Kappa can and do play great football, too.

The playing game also has been assisted by the NCAA. The football scholarship for recruitment has now been abolished on all but a few campuses. A program of grants-in-aid has been substituted. The playing rules have been changed. Free substitution is allowed. The new two platoon system means many more boys can play the game.

But much remains to be done. Today, less than 60,000 play college football—a paltry 1 percent of the student body. The number soon could be doubled. There is a real challenge, a real opportunity for college and university presidents. But the presidents can’t do it alone. They need the enthusiastic support of their governing boards—their trustees, their board of regents, the fellows of their respective corporations. The hundred

institutions that still ban football could soon be made to see the light—in their own interests and in the interests of their undergraduates.

Other colleges and universities throughout the land, supported by the major football conferences, could consider scheduling junior varsity and 150-pound contests along with their varsity games. Such contests are accepted practice in intercollegiate rowing. They would be equally popular in football. Football squads would soon expand. The playing game would grow by leaps and bounds.

Codes and regulations of the several conferences could be clarified to solve remaining problems relating to grants-in-aid. Conferences could arrange central clearinghouses to review and coordinate their policies relating to individual student applicants. High school players would qualify for scholarships—but only to the extent financial assistance was required. Integration of all students in campus life would soon follow. Voluntary spring football practice should be considered everywhere—including the Ivy League. College oarsmen and trackmen, if they choose, now go out in the fall as well as in the spring. There should be no discrimination against students who play football.

College football would continue to attract all who love amateur sport. Big stadiums would continue important on the campus, as will big libraries and big laboratories.

College football, as this foundation has always insisted, could everywhere become part of the college; all players part of the college community; the coaches part of the college faculty. All football teams would then represent their colleges, their universities—not in a journalistic, but in an actual sense.

If this can be brought about, truly brought about, other difficulties will vanish. College football, as a player's game, would not compete with professional football, which is necessarily just a spectacle. But college football, secure from professional competition, would continue to develop and in the true amateur spirit. Ever larger audiences would be drawn, as they used to be, from the men and women who care about the institution and its boys. College football, as a player's game, will produce, not more potential professionals—but more, many more, potential citizens—prepared for the tensions and burdens which our great and noble game has prepared so many men, over so many years, to bear.

LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI: A MEMORIAL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in this time of strained world relations it is truly tragic that the great leader of India, Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri, should be taken from our midst.

His passing is particularly untimely because of the apparent progress which was being made in the talks at Tashkent between India and Pakistan.

At the same time, it is significant that his last official act was the signing of an agreement providing for mutual withdrawal of troops—an act of peace which exemplified a life spent in the search for peace.

In our meeting in New Delhi last month I found the Prime Minister dedicated to the welfare of the Indian people and to the cause of world progress through peaceful cooperation. For his unending zeal and statesmanlike leader-

ship in those two causes he has earned the respect of people everywhere.

His life was a testament to the belief that true strength does not rest in physical stature, but in moral character. Although frail by appearance, there was within him great nobility and courage, and the ability to lead the second largest nation in the world.

To his family, his associates in the Indian Government, and to the people of India I express my deepest sympathy in this hour of bereavement.

It is my great hope that in selecting their new leadership, the Indian people will continue the great tradition of Gandhi, Nehru, and Lal Bahadur Shastri.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to the following:

Mr. KEITH (at the request of Mr. GARMATZ) for the week of January 10, on account of official business.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida (at the request of Mr. GARMATZ), for the week of January 10, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RONCALIO, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include a table.

Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

To the following Members (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON):

Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LAIRD, for 45 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HUTCHINSON.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. CLEVELAND.

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. GOODELL.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. FUQUA.

Mr. FARBSTEIN.

Mr. TENZER.

Mr. REUSS.

Mr. TRIMBLE.

Mr. BRADEMAS.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair is now going to declare a recess until this evening, when the two Houses will meet in joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States.

The House will stand in recess until approximately 8:40 p.m., the bells to be rung at 8:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 8 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arlington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 529. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session to receive a message from the President.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 529 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 321)

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, announced the President pro tempore of the Senate and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore taking the chair at the left of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. ALBERT; the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. BOGGS; the gentleman from New York, Mr. CELLER; the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. GERALD R. FORD; and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ARENDT.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Montana, Mr. MANSFIELD; the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. LONG; the Senator from Georgia, Mr. RUSSELL; the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. FULBRIGHT; the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DIRKSEN; the Senator from California, Mr. KUCHEL; the Senator from Iowa, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. SALTONSTALL.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, announced the ambassadors, ministers, and charges d'affaires of foreign governments.

The ambassadors, ministers, and charges d'affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, announced the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 9 p.m., the Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

THE SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the great pleasure, the highest privilege and the distinguished—and I might also add, personal honor of presenting to you the President of the United States. [Applause, the Members rising.]

THE PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of the House and Senate, my fellow Americans, I come before you tonight to report on the state of the Union for the third time. I come here to thank you and to add my tribute once more to the Nation's gratitude for this, the 89th Congress.

This Congress has already reserved for itself an honored chapter in the history of America.

Our Nation tonight is now engaged in a brutal and bitter conflict in Vietnam. Later on I want to discuss that struggle in some detail with you. It just must be the center of our concerns. But we will not permit those who fire upon us in Vietnam to win a victory over the desires and the intentions of all of the American people. This Nation is mighty enough, its society is healthy enough, its people are strong enough to pursue our goals in the rest of the world while still building a great society at home. And that is what I have come here to ask of you tonight.

I recommend that you provide the resources to carry forward with full vigor the great health and education programs that you enacted into law last year.

I recommend that we prosecute with vigor and determination our war on poverty.

I recommend that you give a new and daring direction to our foreign aid program designed to make a maximum attack on hunger and disease and ignorance in those countries that are determined to help themselves, and to help those nations that are trying to control population growth.

I recommend that you make it possible to expand trade between the United States and Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

I recommend to you a program to rebuild completely on a scale never before attempted entire central and slum areas of several of our cities in America.

I recommend that you attack the wasteful and degrading poisoning of our rivers, and as the cornerstone of this effort clean completely entire large river basins.

I recommend that you meet the growing menace of crime in the streets by building up law enforcement and by revitalizing the entire Federal system from prevention to probation.

I recommend that you take additional steps to insure equal justice to all of our people by effectively enforcing nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection by making it a serious Federal crime to obstruct public and private efforts to secure civil rights and by outlawing discrimination in the sale of rental housing.

I recommend that you help me modernize and streamline the Federal Government by creating a new Cabinet-level Department of Transportation and reorganizing several existing agencies.

In turn I will restructure our civil service in the top grades so that men and women can easily be assigned to jobs where they are most needed, and ability will be both required, as well as rewarded.

I will ask you to make it possible for Members of the House of Representatives to work more effectively in the service of the Nation through a constitutional amendment extending the term of a Congressman to 4 years concurrent with that of the President.

Because of Vietnam we cannot do all that we should or all that we would like to do. We will ruthlessly attack waste and inefficiency. We will make sure that every dollar is spent with the thrift and with the commonsense which recognizes how hard the taxpayer worked in order to earn it.

We will continue to meet the needs of our people by continuing to develop the Great Society.

Last year alone the wealth that we produced increased \$47 billion, and it will soar again this year to a total over \$720 billion. Because our economic policies have produced rising revenues, if you approve every program that I recommend tonight our total budget deficit will be one of the lowest in many years. It will be only \$1.8 billion next year.

Total spending in the administrative budget will be \$112.8 billion. Revenues next year will be \$111 billion. On a cash basis, which is the way that you and I keep our family budget, the Federal budget next year will actually show a surplus.

That is to say, that if we include all the money that your Government will take in and all the money that your Government will spend, your Government next year will collect one-half billion dollars more than it will spend in the year 1967.

I have not come here tonight to ask for pleasant luxuries and for idle pleasures. I have come here to recommend that you, the representatives of the richest Nation on earth, you the elected servants of the people who live in abundance unmatched on this globe, you bring the most urgent decencies of life to all of your fellow Americans.

There are men who cry out that we must sacrifice. Well, let us rather ask them, who will they sacrifice? Are they going to sacrifice the children who seek the learning, or the sick who need medical care, or the families who dwell in squalor that are now brightened by the hope of home? Will they sacrifice opportunity for the distressed, the beauty of our land, the hope of our poor?

Time may require further sacrifices, and if it does, then we will make them. But we will not heed those who wring it from the hopes of the unfortunate here in a land of plenty.

I believe that we can continue the Great Society while we fight in Vietnam. But if there are some who do not believe this, then in the name of justice let them call for the contribution of those who live in the fullness of our blessing, rather than try to strip it from the hands of those that are most in need.

And let no one think that the unfortunate and the oppressed of this land sit stifled and alone in their hope tonight. Hundreds of their servants and their protectors sit before me tonight here in this great Chamber.

The Great Society leads us along three roads—growth and justice and liberation.

First is growth—the national prosperity which supports the well-being of our people and which provides the tools of our progress.

I can report to you tonight what you have seen for yourselves already in almost every city and countryside. This Nation is flourishing. Workers are making more money than ever, with after-tax income in the past 5 years up 33 percent; in the last year alone up 8 percent. More people are working than ever before in our history, an increase last year of 2½ million jobs. Corporations have greater after-tax earnings than ever in history. For the past 5 years those earnings have been up over 65 percent. Last year alone, they had a rise of 20 percent. Average farm income is higher than ever. Over the past 5 years, it is up 40 percent. Over the past year, it was up 22 percent alone.

I was informed this afternoon by the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury that his preliminary estimates indicate that our balance-of-payments deficit has been reduced from \$2.8 billion in 1964 to \$1.3 billion or less in 1965.

This achievement has been made possible by the patriotic voluntary cooperation of businessmen and bankers working with your Government.

We must now work together with increased urgency to wipe out this balance-of-payments deficit altogether in the next year.

As our economy surges toward new heights we must increase our vigilance against the inflation which raises the

cost of living and which lowers the savings of every family in this land. It is essential to prevent inflation that we ask both labor and business to exercise price and wage restraint, and I do so again tonight.

I believe it desirable because of increased military expenditures that you temporarily restore the automobile and certain telephone excise tax reductions made effective only 12 days ago. Without raising taxes or even increasing the total tax bill, we should move to improve our withholding system so that Americans can more realistically pay as they go; speed up the collection of corporate taxes; and make other necessary simplifications of the tax structure at an early date. I hope these measures will be adequate, but if the necessities of Vietnam require it, I will not hesitate to return to the Congress for additional appropriations or additional revenues if they are needed.

The second road is justice. Justice means that a man's hope should not be limited by the color of his skin.

I propose legislation to establish unavoidable requirements for nondiscriminatory jury selection in Federal and State courts, and to give the Attorney General the power necessary to enforce those requirements.

I propose:

Legislation to strengthen the authority of Federal courts to try those who murder, attack, or intimidate either civil rights workers or others exercising their constitutional rights and to increase penalties to a level equal to the nature of the crime.

Legislation resting on the fullest constitutional authority of the Federal Government to prohibit racial discrimination in the sale or rental of housing.

For that other nation, within a nation, the poor whose distress has now captured the conscience of America, I will ask Congress not only to continue but to speed up the war on poverty, and in so doing we will provide the added energy of achievement with the increased efficiency of experience to improve the life of our rural Americans and our farm population. We will plan for the future through the establishment of several new community development districts, improved education through the use of Teacher Corps teams, better health measures, physical examinations, and adequate and available medical resources.

For those who labor I propose to improve unemployment insurance, to expand minimum wage benefits, and by the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act to make the labor laws in all our States equal to the laws of the 31 States which do not have tonight right-to-work measures.

I also intend to ask the Congress to consider measures which without improperly invading State and local authority will enable us effectively to deal with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest.

The third path is the path of liberation. It is to use our success for the fulfillment of our lives. A great nation is one which breeds a great people.

A great people flower not from wealth and power but from a society which spurs them to the fullness of their genius—that alone is a great society.

Yet slowly, painfully on the edge of victory has come the knowledge that shared prosperity is not enough. In the midst of abundance modern man walks oppressed by forces which menace and confine the quality of his life and which individual abundance alone will not overcome.

We can subdue and we can master these forces by bringing increased meaning to our lives if all of us, Government and citizens, are bold enough to change old ways, daring enough to assault new dangers, and if the dream is dear enough to call forth the limitless capacities of this great people.

This year we must continue to improve the quality of American life.

Let us fulfill and improve the great health and education programs of last year, extending special opportunities to those who risk their lives in our Armed Forces.

I urge the House of Representatives to complete action on three programs already passed by the Senate—the Teachers Corps, the rent assistance, and home rule for the District of Columbia.

In some of our urban areas we must help rebuild entire sections and neighborhoods containing in some cases as many as a hundred thousand people. Working together private enterprise and Government must press forward with the task of providing homes and shops, parks and hospitals, and all the other necessary parts of a flourishing community where people can come to live the good life.

I will offer other proposals to stimulate and to reward planning for the growth of entire metropolitan areas.

Of all the reckless devastations of our national heritage none is really more shameful than the continued poisoning of our rivers and our air.

We must undertake a cooperative effort to end pollution in several river basins, making additional funds available to help draw the plans and construct the plants that are necessary to make the waters of our entire river systems clean and make them a source of pleasure and beauty for all of our people.

To attack and to overcome growing crime and lawlessness I think we must have a stepped-up program to help modernize and strengthen our local police forces.

Our people have a right to feel secure in their homes and on their streets, and that right just must be secured.

Nor can we fail to arrest destruction of life and property on our highways.

I will propose a Highway Safety Act of 1966 to seek an end to this mounting tragedy.

We must also act to prevent the deception of the American consumer, requiring all packages to state clearly and truthfully their contents; all interest and credit charges to be fully revealed; and keeping harmful drugs and cosmetics away from our stores.

It is the genius of our Constitution that under its shelter of enduring institutions

and rooted principles there is ample room for the rich fertility of American political invention.

We must change to master change, and I propose to take steps to modernize and streamline the executive branch, to modernize the relations between city and State and Nation.

A new Department of Transportation is needed to bring together our transportation activities. The present structure, 35 Government agencies spending \$5 billion yearly, makes it almost impossible to serve either the growing demands of this great Nation or the needs of the industry or the right of the taxpayer to full efficiency and real frugality.

And I will propose in addition a program to construct and flight test a new supersonic transport airplane that will fly three times the speed of sound, in excess of 2,000 miles per hour.

I propose to examine our Federal system, the relation between city, State, Nation, and the citizens themselves. We need a commission of the most distinguished scholars and men of public affairs to do this job, and I will ask them to move on to develop a creative federalism to best use the wonderful diversity of our institutions and our people to solve the problems and to fulfill the dreams of the American people.

And as the process of election becomes more complex and more costly we must make it possible for those without personal wealth to enter public life without being obligated to a few large contributors.

Therefore, I will submit new legislation to revise the present unrealistic restriction on contribution to prohibit the endless proliferation of committees, bringing local and State committees under the act, to attach strong teeth and severe penalties to the requirement of full disclosure of contribution, and to broaden the participation of the people through added tax incentive, to stimulate small contributions to the party and to the candidate of their choice.

To strengthen the work of Congress I strongly urge an amendment to provide a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives which should not begin before 1972.

The present 2-year term requires most Members of Congress to divert enormous energies to an almost constant process of campaigning, depriving this Nation of the fullest measure of both their skill and their wisdom. Today, too, the work of Government is far more complex than in our early years, requiring more time to learn and more time to master the technical tasks of legislating. And a longer term will serve to attract more men of the highest quality to political life. The Nation, the principle of democracy, and I think each congressional district, will all be better served by a 4-year term for Members of the House, and I urge your swift action.

Tonight the cup of peril is full in Vietnam.

That conflict is not an isolated episode, but another great event in the policy that we have followed with strong consistency since World War II.

The touchstone of that policy is the interest of the United States. But nations sink when they see that interest only through a narrow glass.

In a world that has grown small and dangerous, pursuit of narrow aims could bring decay and even disaster.

An America that is mighty beyond description, yet living in a hostile or despairing world, would be neither safe nor free to build a civilization to liberate the spirit of man.

In this pursuit we helped rebuild Western Europe. We gave our aid to Greece and Turkey, and we defended the freedom of Berlin.

In this pursuit we have helped new nations toward independence, we have extended a helping hand to the Peace Corps and carried forward the largest program of economic assistance in the world.

In this pursuit we worked to build a hemisphere of democracy and of social justice.

In this pursuit we have defended against Communist aggression—in Korea under President Truman, in the Formosa Straits under President Eisenhower, in Cuba under President Kennedy, and again in Vietnam.

Tonight Vietnam must hold the center of our attention, but across the world problems and opportunities crowd in on the American Nation. I will discuss them fully in the months to come, and I will follow the five continuing lines of policy that America has followed under its last four Presidents.

The first principle is strength.

Tonight I can tell you that we are strong enough to keep all of our commitments. We will need expenditures of \$58.3 billion for the next fiscal year to maintain this necessary defense might.

While special Vietnam expenditures for the next fiscal year are estimated to increase by \$5.8 billion, I can tell you that all the other expenditures put together in the entire Federal budget will rise this coming year by only six-tenths of a billion dollars. This is true because of the stringent cost conscious economy program inaugurated in the Defense Department and followed by the other departments of Government.

A second principle of policy is the effort to control, to reduce, and to ultimately eliminate the modern engines of destruction.

We will vigorously pursue existing proposals—and seek new ones—to control arms and stop the spread of nuclear weapons.

A third major principle of our foreign policy is to help build those associations of nations which reflect the opportunities and the necessities of the modern world.

By strengthening the common defense, by stimulating world commerce, by meeting new hopes, these associations serve the cause of a flourishing world.

We will take new steps this year to help strengthen the Alliance for Progress, the unity of Europe, the community of the Atlantic, the regional organizations of developing continents, and that supreme association, the United Nations.

We will work to strengthen economic cooperation, to reduce barriers to trade, and to improve international finance.

A fourth enduring strand of policy has been to help improve the life of man.

From the Marshall plan to this very moment tonight that policy has rested on the claims of compassion and the certain knowledge that only a people advancing in expectation will build secure and peaceful lands.

This year I propose major new directions in our program of foreign assistance to help those countries who will help themselves.

We will conduct a worldwide attack on the problems of hunger and disease and ignorance.

We will place the matchless skill and the resources of our own great America in farming and in fertilizers at the service of those countries committed to develop a modern agriculture.

We will aid those who educate the young in other lands and we will give children in other continents the same headstart that we are trying to give our own children. To advance these ends, I will propose the International Education Act of 1966.

I will also propose the International Health Act of 1966 to strike at disease by a new effort to bring modern skills and knowledge to the uncared for, those suffering in the world, and by trying to wipe out smallpox and malaria and control yellow fever over most of the world during this next decade, to help countries trying to control population growth by increasing our research, and we will earmark funds to help their efforts.

In the next year, from our foreign aid sources we propose to dedicate \$1 billion to these efforts, and we call on all who have the means to join us in this work in the world.

The fifth and most important principle of our foreign policy is support of national independence, the right of each people to govern themselves and to shape their own institutions.

For a peaceful world order will be possible only when each country walks the way that it has chosen to walk for itself.

We follow this principle by encouraging the end of colonial rule.

We follow this principle abroad as well as at home by continued hostility to the rule of the many by the few, or the oppression of one race by another.

We follow this principle by building bridges to Eastern Europe. I will ask the Congress for authority to remove the special tariff restrictions which are a barrier to increasing trade between the East and the West.

The insistent urge toward national independence is the strongest force of today's world in which we live.

In Africa and Asia and Latin America it is shattering the designs of those who would subdue others to their ideas or their will.

It is eroding the unity of what was once a Stalinist empire.

In recent months a number of nations have cast out those who would subject them to the ambitions of mainland China.

History is on the side of freedom and is on the side of societies as shaped from the genius of each people. History does not favor a single system or belief unless force is used to make it so.

And that is why it has been necessary for us to defend this basic principle of our policy—to defend it in Berlin and in Korea and in Cuba and tonight in Vietnam.

For tonight, as so many nights before, young Americans struggle and young Americans die in a distant land.

Tonight, as so many nights before, the American Nation is asked to sacrifice the blood of its children and the fruits of its labor for the love of its freedom.

How many times in my lifetime and in yours have the American people gathered as they do now to hear their President tell them of conflict and tell them of danger.

Each time they have answered, they have answered with all the effort that the security and freedom of this Nation required, and they do again tonight in Vietnam.

Not too many years ago Vietnam was a peaceful if troubled land. In the North was an independent Communist government. In the South a people struggled to build a nation with the friendly help of the United States.

There were some in South Vietnam who wished to force Communist rule on their own people, but their progress was slight. Their hope of success was dim. Then little more than 6 years ago North Vietnam decided on conquest, and from that day to this, soldiers and supplies have moved from North to South in a swelling stream that is swallowing the remnants of revolution and aggression.

And as the assault mounted, our choice gradually became clear. We could leave, abandoning South Vietnam to its attackers and to certain conquest, or we could stay and fight beside the people of South Vietnam.

We stayed. And we will stay until aggression has stopped.

We will stay because a just nation cannot leave to the cruelty of its enemies a people who have staked their lives and independence on America's solemn pledge—a pledge which has grown through the commitments of three American Presidents.

We will stay because in Asia and around the world are countries whose independence rests in large measure on confidence in America's word and in America's protection. To yield to force in Vietnam would weaken that confidence, would undermine the independence of many lands, and would whet the appetite of aggression. We would have to fight in one land and then we would have to fight in another or abandon much of Asia to the domination of Communists.

And we do not intend to abandon Asia to conquest.

Last year the nature of the war in Vietnam changed again. Swiftly increasing numbers of armed men from the North crossed the borders to join forces that were already in the South. Attack and terror increased, spurred and

encouraged by the belief that the United States lacked the will to continue and that their victory was near.

Despite our desire to limit conflict, it was necessary to act to hold back the mounting aggression to give courage to the people of the South and to make our firmness clear to the North. Thus, we began limited air action against military targets in North Vietnam. We increased our fighting force to its present strength tonight of 190,000 men.

These moves have not ended the aggression, but they have prevented its success. The aims of the enemy have been put out of reach by the skill and bravery of Americans and their allies, and by the enduring courage of the South Vietnamese who, I can tell you, lost eight men last year for every one of ours.

The enemy is no longer closer to victory. Time is no longer on his side. There is no cause to doubt the American commitment.

Our decision to stand firm has been matched by our desire for peace.

In 1965 alone we had 300 private talks for peace in Vietnam with friends and adversaries throughout the world.

Since Christmas your Government has labored again with imagination and endurance to remove any barrier to peaceful settlement. For 20 days now we and our Vietnamese allies have dropped no bombs in North Vietnam.

Able and experienced spokesmen have visited in behalf of America more than 40 countries. We have talked to more than a hundred governments, all 113 that we have relations with and some that we do not. We talked to the United Nations, and we called upon all of its members to make any contribution that they could toward helping gain peace.

In public statements and in private communications to adversaries and to friends in Rome and Warsaw, in Paris and Tokyo, in Africa and throughout this hemisphere, America has made her position abundantly clear.

We seek neither territory nor bases, economic domination or military alliance in Vietnam. We fight for the principle of self-determination that the people of South Vietnam should be able to choose their own course, choose it in free elections without violence, without terror, and without fear. The people of all Vietnam should make a free decision on the great question of reunification.

And this is all we want for South Vietnam. It is all the people of South Vietnam want. And if there is a single nation on this earth that desires less than this for its people, then let its voice be heard.

We have also made it clear from Hanoi to New York that there are no arbitrary limits to our search for peace. We stand by the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962. We will meet at any conference table. We will discuss any proposals—4 points or 14 or 40—and we will consider the views of any group. We will work for a cease-fire now, or once discussions have begun.

We will respond if others reduce their use of force and we will withdraw our soldiers once South Vietnam is securely

guaranteed the right to shape its own future.

We have said all this and we have asked and hoped and we have waited for a response.

So far we have received no response to prove either success or failure.

We have carried our quest for peace to many nations and peoples because we share this planet with others whose future, in large measure, is tied to our own action and whose counsel is necessary to our own hopes.

We have found understanding and support, and we know they wait with us tonight for some response that could lead to peace.

I wish tonight that I could give you a blueprint for the course of this conflict over the coming months, but we just cannot know what the future may require. We may have to face long, hard combat or a long, hard conference or even both at once.

Until peace comes, or if it does not come, our course is clear. We will act as we must to help protect the independence of the valiant people of South Vietnam. We will strive to limit the conflict, for we wish neither increased destruction nor do we want to invite increased danger.

But we will give our fighting men what they must have, every gun and every dollar and every decision, whatever the cost or whatever the challenge.

And we will continue to help the people of South Vietnam care for those that are ravaged by battle, create progress in the villages, and carry forward the healing hopes of peace as best they can amidst the uncertain terrors of war.

And let me be absolutely clear. The days may become months and the months may become years, but we will stay as long as aggression commands us to battle.

There may be some who do not want peace, whose ambitions stretch so far that war in Vietnam is but a welcome and convenient episode in an immense design to subdue history to their will. But for others it must now be clear that the choice is not between peace and victory. It lies between peace and the ravages of a conflict from which they can only lose.

The people of Vietnam, North and South, seek the same things, the shared needs of man—the needs for food and shelter and education—the chance to build and work and till the soil free from the arbitrary horrors of battle—the desire to walk in the dignity of those who master their own destiny. For many painful years, in war and revolution and infrequent peace, they have struggled to fulfill those needs.

It is a crime against mankind that so much courage and so much will and so many dreams must be flung on the fires of war and death.

To all of those caught up in this conflict we therefore say again tonight: Let us choose peace, and with it the wondrous works of peace, and beyond that, the time when hope reaches toward consummation, and life is the servant of life.

In this work we plan to discharge our duty to the people whom we serve.

This is the state of the Union.

But over it all—wealth and promise—and expectation—lies our troubling awareness of American men at war tonight.

How many men who listen to me tonight have served their Nation in other wars? How very many are not here to listen?

War in Vietnam is not like these other wars; yet, finally, war is always the same. It is young men dying in the fullness of their promise. It is trying to kill a man that you do not even know well enough to hate.

Therefore, to know war is to know that there is still madness in this world.

Many of you share the burden of this knowledge tonight with me. But there is a difference. For, finally, I must be the one to order our guns to fire—against all the most inward pulls of my desire. For we have children to teach, and we have sick to be cured, and we have men to be freed. There are poor to be lifted up and there are cities to be built and there is a world to be helped.

Yet, we will do what we must.

I am hopeful and I will try the best I can with everything I have to end this battle and to return our sons to their desires.

Yet, as long as others will challenge America's security and test the dearness of our beliefs with fire and steel, then we must stand or see the promise of two centuries tremble. I believe tonight that you do not want me to try that risk. And from that belief, your President summons his strength for the trials that lie ahead in the days to come.

The work must be our work now. Scarred by the weaknesses of man, with whatever guidance God may offer us, we must nevertheless, and alone, with our mortality, strive to ennoble the life of man on earth.

Thank you and good night.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 9 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m., the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the message of the President is referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the

House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 13, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 89th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (2 U.S.C. 25), approved February 18, 1948: CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR., 7th District, Ohio, EDWIN W. EDWARDS, 7th District, Louisiana, and THOMAS M. REES, 26th District, California.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1867. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 404(d) and 408 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize members of the uniformed services to be reimbursed under certain circumstances for the actual cost of parking fees, ferry fares, and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1868. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting the Annual Report of the Office of Civil Defense of the District of Columbia, for fiscal year 1965, pursuant to Public Law 81-686; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1869. A letter from Steptoe & Johnson, attorneys at law, Washington, D.C., transmitting the Annual Report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co. for the year ended December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1870. A letter from the vice president, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting the Annual Report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1965, pursuant to law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1871. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report of all compensatory royalty agreements affecting oil and gas deposits in unleased Government lands which were entered into during calendar year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of 30 U.S.C. 226(g); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1872. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the 31st annual report of the Commission covering the fiscal year July 1, 1964, to June 30, 1965, pursuant to law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1873. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered, as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 13(c) of the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1874. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1875. A letter from the Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, transmitting the final report of the U.S. Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-447; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1876. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered into in cases of certain aliens, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(d)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1877. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Nationality Act, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report of visa petitions, according the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1878. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a list of positions in the Legislative Reference Service allocated to certain grades, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 84-854; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1879. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a report of a position established "in addition to the number of positions otherwise authorized by law to be placed in such grade," pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 84-854; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1880. A letter from the Postmaster General and the Chairman, Board of Trustees, Postal Savings System, transmitting the report of operations of the Postal Savings System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89-348 (H. Doc. No. 331); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER (by request):

H.R. 11965. A bill to amend chapter XIII of the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 11966. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 11967. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 26, 1934, to authorize the overprinting of certain of such stamps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 11968. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include drugs requiring a doctor's prescription among the medical expenses with respect to which payment may be made under the voluntary program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARNUM:

H.R. 11969. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 11970. A bill to provide educational assistance to certain veterans of service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 11971. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase by 10 percent the amount of retirement, annuity, and endowment payments excluded from income for the purpose of determining the eligibility of an individual for pension under that title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 11972. A bill relating to dealings in good faith between parties to franchise agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 11973. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 11974. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RACE:

H.R. 11975. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to make discrimination because of age in employment an unlawful employment practice; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REDLIN:

H.R. 11976. A bill to establish the resale price of wheat at 115 percent of the support price; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 11977. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 11978. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase by 10 percent the income limitations applicable to the payment of pensions under that chapter to veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and to widows and children of such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 11979. A bill to make permanent the act of May 22, 1965, authorizing the payment of special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 11980. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to donate two obsolete German weapons to the Federal Republic of Germany; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 11981. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 11982. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 11983. A bill to amend section 120 of title 23 of the United States Code to increase the Federal share payable to certain States on account of Interstate System projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 11984. A bill to amend section 701 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize additional accumulation of leave in certain foreign areas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 11985. A bill to provide educational assistance for veterans who have served in the Armed Forces since October 1, 1963; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 11986. A bill to prohibit reimbursement at Government expense under section 4167(a) of title 39, United States Code, of matter mailed by Members of Congress and certain other officials under the franking privilege without specific address, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CALLAN:

H.R. 11987. A bill to amend the internal revenue excise tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 11988. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 11989. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to make discrimination because of age in employment an unlawful employment practice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11990. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional first-year depreciation allowance (up to 100 percent of cost) for new waste treatment facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 11991. A bill to provide a program of Federal assistance to elementary schools throughout the Nation to improve educational opportunities through provision for the services of child development specialists and to provide a program of Federal assistance for the training of such elementary school personnel in the institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 11992. A bill to amend title 37 of the United States Code with respect to individuals who are to be included as dependents under chapter 7 of that title; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 11993. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 11994. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a full tax deduction for child care expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 11995. A bill to provide educational assistance to certain veterans of service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 11996. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to permit the waiver of certain retirement or annuity payments under programs administered by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 11997. A bill to amend and extend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 11998. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11999. A bill to amend section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase to \$250 million the authorization for fiscal year 1967, and to authorize reimbursement of States that prefinance certain treatment works; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 12000. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall disclose certain information in his files to courts of competent jurisdiction to assist them in connection with the issuance of child support orders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 12001. A bill to amend paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368); to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 12002. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Department of the Navy shall have the rank of vice admiral; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 12003. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that monthly social security benefit payments shall not be included as income for the purpose of determining eligibility for a pension under title 38; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 12004. A bill to improve payroll administration with respect to payment of compensation from clerk hire of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 12005. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 12006. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 12007. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase by 10 percent the amount of retirement, annuity, and endowment payments excluded from income for the purpose of determining the eligibility of an individual for pension under that title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.J. Res. 797. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REDLIN:

H.J. Res. 798. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H.J. Res. 799. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the last week of October 1966 as National Gifted Child Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.J. Res. 800. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to issue annually a proclamation designating June as Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H. Con. Res. 531. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 532. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 565, and House Report No. 952 (89th Cong., 1st sess.); to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H. Res. 636. Resolution providing for further expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 13; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RYAN:

H. Res. 637. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 638. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H. Res. 639. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to transfer the responsibilities of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H. Res. 640. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to employ eight additional employees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. Res. 641. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings in the Hall of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H. Res. 642. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings in the Hall of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H. Res. 643. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings in the Hall of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H. Res. 644. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings in the Hall of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H. Res. 645. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings in the Hall of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H. Res. 646. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings in the Hall of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H. Res. 647. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings in the Hall of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H. Res. 648. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings in the Hall of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H. Res. 649. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings in the Hall of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H. Res. 650. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings in the Hall of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. Res. 651. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings before committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H. Res. 652. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings before committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H. Res. 653. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings before committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H. Res. 654. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings before committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H. Res. 655. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings before committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H. Res. 656. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings before committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H. Res. 657. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings before committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H. Res. 658. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings before committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H. Res. 659. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings before committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H. Res. 660. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings before committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 12008. A bill for the relief of Caterina Caliendo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12009. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Colombo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 12010. A bill for the relief of Richard C. Mockler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 12011. A bill for the relief of Rachel Stimpson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.:

H.R. 12012. A bill for the relief of Thomas M. Scanlon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 12013. A bill for the relief of Bernard L. Gomberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 12014. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clotilde Arnoldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana:

H.R. 12015. A bill for the relief of Cotton Products Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 12016. A bill for the relief of Wong Yue Hong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 12017. A bill for the relief of Alberto E. Diaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 12018. A bill for the relief of Mr. Chung-Yen Mao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 12019. A bill for the relief of Antonio Enzo De Paris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 12020. A bill for the relief of Amado Manuel Vina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 12021. A bill for the relief of Leda Kemmet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 12022. A bill for the relief of Terrance L. Lindemann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 12023. A bill for the relief of Itzhak Feldman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 12024. A bill for the relief of William Temes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 12025. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose V. Yason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12026. A bill for the relief of Achille Buonapane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12027. A bill for the relief of Herman Hyman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 12028. A bill for the relief of Jai-Poong Cho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12029. A bill for the relief of Harzal M. Rahmani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 12030. A bill for the relief of John Burnham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 12031. A bill to authorize the appointment of Col. William W. Watkin, Jr., professor of the U.S. Military Academy, in the grade of lieutenant colonel, Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 12032. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nacima Antoun Charchafiah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 12033. A bill for the relief of Antonio Manuel de Rezende de Sousa Andrade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 12034. A bill for the relief of Evana J. Roberts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 12035. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Mangiameli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.J. Res. 801. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week beginning March 14, 1966, as National Citrus Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

312. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the International Woodworkers of America, Portland, Oreg., relative to the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 12, 1966

The Senate met at 8 o'clock p.m., pursuant to the order of January 10, 1966, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Bishop W. Earl Ledden, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast brought us to this high hour, we give Thee hearty thanks that tonight we, and the Nation, may hear the voice of the President of the United States. We are grateful for his restoration to health, and we pray that Thou wilt continually replenish his strength and wisdom and courage.

Be Thou with the millions across the Nation who will listen to the President tonight. Prepare them all, by love of country and dedication to its lofty principles, to hear with open mind and loyal devotion to America. Give all to recognize how great a thing it is to hear without distortion: what demand it makes upon the sincerity of our pursuit of truth, the purity of our dedication to equal justice under law, the reach of our compassion, the sensitivity of our conscience.

Make us equal, then, to the demands upon all hearers this night, that we all may remember the words of our Lord when He said, *Take heed how ye hear.*

In His name. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that Hon. CARL ALBERT, a Representative from the State of Oklahoma, had been elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The message also notified the Senate that a committee of three Members had been appointed by the Speaker pro tempore on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had been assembled, and that the Congress was ready to receive

any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The message further notified the Senate that a quorum of the House was present and that the House was ready to proceed with business.

The message announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 529) providing for a joint session to receive a message from the President, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina, and transmitted the resolution of the House thereon.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the joint committee appointed by the Senate and the House of Representatives to notify the President that quorums of the two Houses have assembled and are ready to receive any communication he may desire to make have performed that duty and now report that at 9 o'clock tonight the President will deliver to Congress his message on the state of the Union.

JOINT SESSION TO RECEIVE MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 529, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 529, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 529) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, January 12, 1966, at 9 o'clock p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as

the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the joint session tonight to hear the President of the United States deliver his state of the Union message, the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL 8:30 P.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Senators are expected to gather here and to leave the Senate Chamber at 8:42. Therefore, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 8:30 p.m., at which time there will be a quorum call before proceeding to the House Chamber.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until 8:30 p.m. today.

At 8:30 o'clock p.m., on the expiration of the recess, the Senate reconvened, when called to order by the President pro tempore.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

The following additional Senators attended the session of the Senate tonight:

E. L. BARTLETT, a Senator from the State of Alaska; SAM J. ERVIN, JR., a Senator from the State of North Carolina; HENRY M. JACKSON, a Senator from the State of Washington; THRUSTON B. MORTON, a Senator from the State of Kentucky; ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, a Senator from the State of Connecticut; and HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., a Senator from the State of New Jersey.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES—MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 321)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is now time for the Senate to move as a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

Thereupon (at 8 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.) the Senate, preceded by the administrative assistant to the Sergeant at Arms (William S. Cheatham); the Secretary of the Senate (Emery L. Frazier); the Sergeant at Arms-designate, Robert G. Dunphy, and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear the address by the President of the United States on the state of the Union.

(The address by the President of the United States, this day delivered by him to the joint session of the two Houses of Congress, appears in the proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's RECORD.)

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

At the conclusion of the joint session of the two Houses, and in accordance with the order previously entered, at 9 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m., the Senate adjourned until Friday, January 14, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Morris Weinberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTAIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, Morris Weinberg will celebrate his 90th birthday. At the same time, he and his gracious wife, Dora, will celebrate their 65th wedding anniversary. It gives me great pleasure to salute these fine people who have contributed so much to the enrichment of American life.

Morris Weinberg is the founder of the Day-Jewish Journal, a paper which has been an important voice in Jewish-American affairs since 1914. But even before that, Morris Weinberg was a dynamic force. Since the turn of the century, he has been a man who has devoted himself to noble causes. His is a name that evokes the warmest feelings of admiration and respect. He has served his people and his country very, very well.

Mr. and Mrs. Weinberg are currently enjoying in Palm Beach, Fla., a retirement which they have both earned. I am certain that my colleagues, of whatever faith they may be, join me in extending their salutations and best wishes to Morris and Dora Weinberg. I wish

them many, many more years of fruitful and happy life. They are a wonderful example of fine Jews and fine Americans.

George Perrin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, George Perrin, president of Plastics Research

& Development Corp., Fort Smith, Ark., is a resident of the district which I am honored to represent. In December he was named to receive the 1966 American Success Story Award, 1 of only 10 businessmen throughout the country to be so named, by the Free Enterprise Awards Association, Inc.

Mr. Perrin was cited for one man's ability to build a prestige independent business by seeking out and filling industrial needs. From a modest start, he built Plastics Research & Development Corp. to a 60,000-square-foot plant with completely coordinated facilities for product development, mold building, custom molding, assembly, packaging and distribution serving leading manufacturers and distributors. Divisions of Plastics Research manufacture and distribute home decorative products, toys, military identification, and fishing tackle, with worldwide sales employing 200 people. Especially noted are his 124 models of realistic fishing lures.

We are proud to have him in our area. He is doing a wonderful job for the State of Arkansas and for the country as a whole. My heartiest congratulations to George Perrin.

A Call for a Public Awareness of U.S. Maritime Plight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in the January issue of the magazine *Navy*, published by the Navy League of the United States there is an article which I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues. This article consists of excerpts from a speech by Capt. James E. Heg, U.S. Navy, and is entitled "A Call for a Public Awareness of U.S. Maritime Plight."

Captain Heg, in his speech, calls upon the public to awaken to the facts about the critical state of our merchant marine. He astutely points out the fact that the Soviet Union is planning a modern automated merchant marine and that it is ironic that we as a nation compare all of our forms of power to that of the Soviet Union with the exception of our merchant marine power.

Mr. Speaker, within a few years, Captain Heg points out, the Soviet Union will be in a position to dominate the sea lanes and he leaves it to his readers' speculation as to what such a situation could portend for the United States. He goes further by pointing to the great amount of money that is being spent in other areas of transportation.

This article points out that since the Merchant Marine Act was passed in 1936 that the United States has spent more on the development of one single aircraft than it has in all 29 years in the area of merchant marine development. As a matter of fact, during 1966 the U.S. Maritime Administration is slated to spend

no more than the minuscule sum of \$250,000 on research and development toward advanced ships and systems. Compare this with what we are spending for air transportation and other means of defense.

I commend this article to my colleagues.

The Plight of the Little Businessman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, during the recess, in traveling about my part of Michigan, I was of course pleased to note the general feeling of prosperity, but was dismayed to observe the number of truly small businesses that have closed their doors; small merchants on the main streets of country towns. I am certain this condition is not peculiar to my district but is general throughout the Nation. The really small businessman, managing his own store, running his own shop, employing a few people, has been much more than a symbol of enterprise in the rural communities of America.

Much of the plight in which the little businessman finds himself today is due to governmentally imposed regulation. No one outside these groups of doughty competitors realizes the economic burden which a multitude of increasingly complex reports for governmental agencies casts upon them. Burdensome and equivocal regulations, sometimes misinterpreted by Government employees in the field, to impose impossible economic burdens, have been enough to drive the smallest enterpriser from the ranks of the self-employed.

Mr. Speaker, it has been truly said that a business enterprise never stands still. In business you either go forward or backward. These small business people do not complain about the rigors of competition. They are willing to take their chances with their competitors. Their plea is to be freed from Government regulations written with big business in mind, which overburden them but are taken by their bigger competitors in stride as part of overhead.

In recent months I have received several letters from small businessmen in my district making this plea. Among them is a letter from Fred Koning, a restaurateur in Douglas, Mich., within my congressional district. The Saugeatuck-Douglas area is one of Michigan's fine summer resorts, and Fred Koning, in a long-established business, has been successful thus far. But he writes me as follows:

During the last three decades, we have seen fit to subsidize the world, the farmer, the laborer, the Negro, the poor, including the ones that could work but won't. There are families that have prospered on relief.

On the other hand, the Government has guaranteed big business a profit by letting contracts on a cost-plus basis.

Have the powers that be ever considered the little businessman? I don't mean the small businessman; I mean the little ones, like myself.

We have never asked for nor wanted any subsidies. All we want is a chance to survive. How many of the legislators who are so concerned with the welfare of the masses have ever been in a competitive field and have had to earn a living by competition, let alone meet a payroll?

Wouldn't it be possible to think of all of us instead of the select groups they have seen fit to sponsor?

As little business people, all we ask is the right to run our own business—sink or swim—and pay our taxes.

Respectfully,

FRED KONING.

Mr. Speaker, we would do a better job at lawmaking, and the bureaucracy would write fairer regulations, if the concerns of little businessmen were taken into account. All big business started small. The man or woman who has an idea and the ability and courage to venture it in competitive enterprise still contributes much to our progress; and Government should take care in its laws and regulations that an economic, political, and social climate encouraging small business is fostered.

Anniversary of Independence of Chad, January 11, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, on January 11, 1966, a country formerly part of French Equatorial Africa, but with an area more than twice that of France, celebrated the anniversary of its independence.

That nation, Chad, had been one of the four territories in French Equatorial Africa since 1910. Through a series of progressive steps, which included the dissolution of French Equatorial Africa in 1959, Chad assumed a place among independent nations of the world in 1960.

Little is known of the early history of this landlocked area. At the time of first reports from European travelers in the late 19th century, individual domains were ruled by warring sultans and the territory served primarily as a hunting ground for foreign slave traders.

Today, President François Tombalbaye leads the nation under a constitution approved in 1962. President Tombalbaye and his 2.8 million fellow citizens are moving their new nation forward on all fronts—political, social, and economic.

Although Chad has a desert area as large as the State of Texas, it is self-sufficient in food production. National imports reached \$34 million and exports \$25 million in 1964. The United States is participating in the economic development of Chad with a modest aid pro-

gram which, since 1962, has averaged some \$700,000 annually.

Chad maintains friendly relations with our country and retains close ties with France as a member of the French Community. It has occupied a seat in the United Nations since 1960.

Therefore, it is appropriate that the United States, conscious of its own relative youth, acknowledge and offer congratulations upon the anniversary of independence of a still younger member of the community of nations.

Salute to Sudan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, the Republic of Sudan celebrated the 10th anniversary of her independence. As you are aware, the 2d session of the 89th Congress had not yet convened. However, I did not want the opportunity overlooked to extend to the people and the Government of Sudan the warmest felicitations of this country on this occasion. Congratulations are therefore extended on this occasion to His Excellency Ismail el Ezhari, the President of the Supreme Council of State; and to His Excellency Abbash el Obeid, the Sudanese Ambassador to the United States.

Traditionally, most Americans anxiously await the end of an old year and look forward to the approach of the new year in anticipation of prosperity, progress, and peace. But January 1 has even more significance to the people of the Republic of the Sudan.

It was on this date in 1956 that this huge country was proclaimed an independent and sovereign state. Comprising an area almost one-tenth of the African continent, this young and dynamic Republic is a land of more than 12 million inhabitants.

However, it should be noted that while the Sudan is celebrating its 10th anniversary as an independent Republic, its historical legacy goes back very far indeed. Ancient Egyptian inscriptions and references in the Old Testament—to the Land of Kush—bear evidence of the Sudan's past greatness. During most of the 19th century, the Sudan was under Turkish-Egyptian subjugation with a short period of independence between 1885 and 1899. Following the joint British-Egyptian reconquest of the country in 1896-98, a new governmental system had to be devised. This resulted in joint Anglo-Egyptian administration or condominium, as the system was called.

The Sudan is a land of sharp contrasts, divided between the economically developed Moslem north and the largely pagan and Christian underdeveloped south. However, strong efforts are being made to overcome these and other handicaps.

Sudan's somewhat small and scattered population and lack of known resources has forced the country's economy to remain primarily an agricultural one. Cotton is the mainstay of the Sudanese economy, and accounts for approximately 70 percent of the country's total exports and about 30 percent of the total world production of the long staple variety. The Gezira scheme, which developed a large portion of the south to relative wealth, has proved itself a model of agricultural achievement which other undeveloped areas conceivably could adopt. Extensive irrigation could increase the chances for an even more diversified economy. Liberal foreign trade policies have aided in stimulating Sudan's exports and imports. Its world trade balance is satisfactory and foreign exchange reserves have steadily grown to over \$150 million. Annual capital formation is at approximately 10 percent and development investments are growing at a rate of more than 8 percent of the gross national product, which has been estimated at \$900 million.

Internal problems have not prevented the Sudan from taking an active part in international affairs, as its membership in the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa has demonstrated; in addition, the Sudan is an important member in such organizations as the League of Arab States, the Organization of African Unity, and the International Cotton Advisory Committee.

Though the Sudan has been experiencing what one might call growing pains there is little doubt as to the resolution and determination of this large and friendly country to meet the challenges and overcome the difficulties which beset it.

I am certain that the entire American people join me in extending warm and sincere congratulations on this, the 10th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of the Sudan.

Ski in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Congressional Sponsoring Committee, I call your attention to the first annual Pennsylvania Ski Ball which will take place next Saturday evening, January 15, at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in this city. The affair is designed to promote our State's rapidly growing recreation industry, particularly the outstanding ski resorts, as well as to make a contribution to assist in financing the U.S. ski team at the next Olympic games.

Winter sports enthusiasts in this area should be especially interested in the excellent winter sports facilities now available in Pennsylvania. It is a long day's trip to New Hampshire or Vermont, but Pennsylvania's winter wonderlands are

between 2 and 4 hours by car from the Nation's Capital. Many groups and families leave Washington on Friday afternoons to enjoy full weekends of winter sports in our State.

Gov. William Scranton and Senators HUGH SCOTT and JOSEPH S. CLARK, Jr., are honorary chairmen of the Pennsylvania Ski Ball sponsored by the Pennsylvania Society of Washington. General chairman is Attorney William D. Patton, of Johnstown, who is vice president of the society. We all invite you to take advantage of the healthy recreational facilities that are in such easy reach of this area.

Paralyzed at 9, Dicky Chaput Wins Jaycee Outstanding Young Man Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, next Saturday in St. Paul, Minn., Richard Raymond Chaput, of Nashua, N.H., will be honored by the National Junior Chamber of Commerce as one of 10 outstanding young men in America for 1965.

The great dimensions of this achievement become clear when one realizes that Richard Chaput has been paralyzed from the neck down by childhood polio for 21 of his 28 years. For much of his boyhood, his adolescence, and now in his young manhood, Richard Chaput has been confined to bed. His nights must be spent in an iron lung.

In his book, "Not To Doubt," Mr. Chaput describes the physical and mental torment through which he passed and how he overcame the blackest depression and despair, with the aid of his native cheerfulness and a rocklike faith in God. He is also the first to recognize the essential love and support received from his family and friends, particularly his parents.

INSPIRATION TO THOUSANDS

Through his book, his articles, and stories, Richard Chaput has touched and inspired countless thousands. The act of writing is immensely difficult for him. Because of his affliction, it is hard for him to speak and he cannot use his hands or arms at all. Dictating letters or other writing is very difficult. Most of his writing is done on an ingenious electric typewriter specially designed so that he can operate it painstakingly with his tongue.

I first met him in person last year when I called on him at the nursing home where he was staying. It was apparent at once that here was a most unusual person. He had accepted his grievous condition philosophically, not without question, but without wasting time in railing and complaining against a situation which was beyond the power of man to change.

NASHUA MAN OF THE YEAR

He was named Man of the Year by the Nashua Junior Chamber of Commerce

last year and soon thereafter the process was started to nominate him for the national honors now accorded to him. I was honored to endorse this nomination on his behalf and I now feel honored once more to pay him this tribute in the House of Representatives.

He is a truly outstanding and most inspirational American. I congratulate him on his award and I congratulate the Jaycees on the wisdom of their choice.

One-Quarter Century of Farm-Labor-Consumer Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of its 25 years of service, the California Farm Research and Legislative Committee published an interesting and colorful brochure entitled "One-Quarter Century of Farm-Labor-Consumer Action." The purpose of the brochure is to review the history and accomplishments of the committee, and this purpose is certainly well achieved.

The Farm Research and Legislative Committee had its beginning in February 1941, when, due to the loss of an export market in war-torn Europe and the subsequent sharp drop in the price of fruit, Santa Clara County prune and apricot growers banded together to ask for purchase by the Federal Government of some of the unsold fruit. This first unified effort resulted in an appropriation of \$25 million and a successful increase in the market price of fruit.

Behind the developing variety of programs which the committee has worked for, the overriding commitment was and is to the family farm, the farm which provides a living for a farm family, members of which do most of the work rather than directing the work of others. To help insure the economic survival of the family farm the committee places top priority in establishing jointly owned and operated farmer-to-consumer marketing and distribution co-operatives. To achieve this goal, the committee is working with farm groups, other cooperatives, and organized labor.

The hope is that such cooperatives will help to reduce the sometimes very great spread between consumer prices and what the farmer receives. For while the general standard and cost of living have been rising, the level of farm income has been a consistent problem. As "One-Quarter Century" illustrates, "from 1953 to 1964, net farm operator's income dropped at an average annual rate of 1.4 percent. In 1964 per capita non-farm income was \$2,595; in contrast per capita farm income was \$966."

The Farm Research and Legislative Committee is not concerned only, however, with the level of farm income. The committee has taken an active role in the

advocacy of a Federal food stamp program to provide a better diet for low-income families, of a Federal school milk program, and of lower gas and electric rates in the region. Further, their international concern is evident in the committee's early support and educational campaign for the establishment of the United Nations as well as the Food and Agriculture Organization's freedom-from-hunger campaign.

Accurately described in this brochure as the "nerve center" for the Farm Research and Legislative Committee is its executive secretary Mrs. Grace McDonald, who doubles her tremendous workload by serving as executive secretary for the Northern California Freedom-From-Hunger Campaign. Judging from the achievements of the past 25 years, I feel confident that Mrs. McDonald and her associates on the California Farm Research and Legislative Committee will continue to work successfully with and for farmers, laborers, and consumers in California.

Interest on Poor Man's Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times on January 11 had an editorial entitled "Fair Play on Savings Bonds" and because I agree with the sentiments expressed in the editorial, I am calling it to the attention of my colleagues by quoting it now at length.

FAIR PLAY ON SAVINGS BONDS

Alert investors have been getting much higher yields since the Federal Reserve raised interest rates in December. But buyers of savings bonds from the U.S. Treasury still receive just 3½ percent on their purchases. Thus the Treasury is, in effect, shortchanging savings bond buyers, who are mainly people in the low- and middle-income brackets.

Apparently these small savers are also learning that savings bonds are no bargain. Despite the fact that many bonds are bought through payroll deduction plans, sales in December were 11 percent less than they were a year earlier.

A higher rate of interest on Treasury savings bonds would protect small investors who do not know their way around the financial markets. By increasing purchases of the bonds, it would also help the fight against inflation. There is no need to make bond rates competitive with marketable Treasury obligations, which fluctuate in price, or even with the new high rates being offered financial institutions. Savings bonds are the safest of securities and offer a tax advantage as well; so a small increase would suffice.

The President has the power to raise the rate to a maximum of 4½ percent. It will take at least 4 percent to play fair with small savers. We think 4 percent should be offered them—and soon.

Because most of the holders of Treasury savings bonds are in the low- and middle-income bracket and have no lobby here in Washington, I am prepared

to join others who articulate their problems, in endeavoring to get the President of the United States to exercise his power to raise the rate of interest on these bonds.

It is most significant that on the same day that this editorial appeared in the Times there were other articles in the Wall Street Journal which pointed up the necessity for Presidential action at this time. These articles contained the following significant information:

First. Yields on Treasury's latest issues of short-term bills hit a 6-year high. Yields on 26-week bills rose to 4.737 percent and the average return to investors on 13-week bills rose to 4.585 percent. These Treasury bills are purchased primarily by banks and large corporations.

Second. Short-term interest rates resumed an upward course along a broad front since the Federal Reserve Board boosted the discount rate to 4½ percent last December 5. Large New York City, Chicago, and west coast banks are offering 4.875 percent on certificates of deposit of 180 days and longer.

Third. GMAC and International Harvester increased their rate on 180- to 270-day paper to 4½ percent.

Mr. Speaker, because of all of these events, I am urging the President and the Secretary of the Treasury to increase interest rates on Treasury savings bonds to the maximum limit of the President's power, but in any event to at least 4 percent.

Service of General Wadsworth Outstanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, January 16, 1966, will mark the retirement of Brig. Gen. Louie C. Wadsworth from the National Guard.

With his retirement a chapter closes in Florida National Guard history and his place will be difficult to fill. His has been a record of dedication and service, and I join with his friends throughout the State and Nation in paying tribute to him as he concludes a distinguished military career.

Ceremonies Sunday will see General Wadsworth promoted to Major General and retired.

So closes a career that began when he enlisted in Company E, 154th Infantry, Florida National Guard in Live Oak, Fla., April 18, 1923.

General Wadsworth rose through the ranks, being commissioned a second lieutenant in 1936. He held this rank when called to active duty in November 1940. He served with the 124th Infantry as platoon leader, company commander, battalion executive officer, and battalion commander at Camp Blanding, Fla., and Fort Benning, Ga., in January 1944.

He later served as regimental executive officer and regimental commander of the 3d Student Regiment, the Infantry School.

He served in the Asiatic-Pacific Theater as G-3 with general headquarters, Armed Forces, Pacific, from June 1945 until December of that year.

Released from active duty at Camp Blanding, April 26, 1946, with the rank of colonel, he accepted an Organized Reserve Corps appointment prior to release from active duty, and served in this capacity until named battalion commander, 1st Battalion, 124th Infantry Regiment in grade of lieutenant colonel. He was promoted to colonel and July 29, 1962, was promoted to brigadier general and served as assistant division commander until reorganization in 1963 when he was redesignated as deputy commander of the division, the position which he held upon retiring.

His decorations and awards include the American Defense Service Medal, American Campaign Medal, Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal, World War II Victory Medal, Army Forces Reserve Medal and two hourglass devices, Philippine Liberation Medal, Florida Distinguished Service Medal, Florida Service Medal, and Active State Service Ribbon.

In addition to his distinguished military service, General Wadsworth has been an outstanding citizen in his role as publisher of the Suwannee Democrat, respected weekly newspaper in Live Oak.

Under his leadership, the Suwannee Democrat has been cited with most of Florida's major weekly newspaper awards and has been in the forefront of activities which have led to progress for the county and its people.

Born May 30, 1906, in Mayo, Fla., he moved to Live Oak at the age of six and has made his home there since that time with the exception of the time spent in college and the armed services.

The son of the late Charles Randell Wadsworth, Sr., and Mrs. Nellie Wadsworth, he attended Suwannee High School and graduated with the class of 1924. He graduated from Davidson College in North Carolina. After working for a year with the Addressograph Co., he returned to Live Oak in 1931 to become editor of the Suwannee Democrat and has been connected with the paper since, with the exception of the time spent in military service.

He served as president of the National Guard Officers Association in Florida in 1950. He served two terms as president of the Suwannee County Chamber of Commerce, and in 1955 was named Man of the Year in Suwannee County.

Another primary interest in his civic life was his membership on the board of trustees of the Suwannee County Hospital, a position he held many years.

He is a member of the Kiwanis Club and has been active in various other civic groups. He served as lieutenant governor of the Florida district for Kiwanis Clubs.

He served as president of the Rotary Club in 1938 and was president of the junior chamber of commerce in 1940. He

served as commander of the Suwannee Post 107, American Legion, in 1951.

One of his continuing interests has been the Suwannee County Fair, serving several times as president. He was one of the founders of the present fair and is the only director left of the original group.

He served as postmaster in Live Oak from July 1947 to September 1948.

In 1956 he served as chairman of a county commission-appointed committee to construct the coliseum building in Live Oak.

The publication of the newspaper and the operation of its plant has been the primary interest and concern of the publisher through the years. Active in the Florida Press Association, he served as president in 1948-49, and served for 11 years as a director of the association.

As publisher of the paper, he has directed the Suwannee Democrat to a position of high regard among the press of Florida.

He also published the Dixie County Advocate in Cross City, the Mayo Free Press in Mayo and the Branford Herald in Branford for a number of years.

The Wadsworths make their home on the corner of 11th Street and Pine Avenue in Live Oak. He is married to the former Miss Clara Staley, and they have two daughters, Mrs. Gayle McCrimmon, and Charlotte.

General Wadsworth is a warm, personal friend, and I wanted to take this opportunity to pay tribute to him as he concludes his distinguished service in the National Guard. His shoes will be hard to fill, and I know that he can look back with a great deal of satisfaction and personal pride in the great contributions which he has made.

Let's Remove Politics and Profit From the War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Representative DON H. CLAUSEN, of California, before the California State Chamber of Commerce. Representative CLAUSEN is a great independent thinker with a wealth of fresh, interesting, and new ideas. His speech offers an incisive analysis of the poverty program.

The speech follows:

LET'S REMOVE POLITICS AND PROFIT FROM THE WAR ON POVERTY

(Address of Congressman DON H. CLAUSEN before the California State Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles, Dec. 9, 1965)

The so-called war on poverty got off to a bad start and is still in deep trouble. In the past few days, scandalous headlines were appearing with increasing frequency as I left Washington. Many Members of Congress pointed out in the congressional debate this

year the problems inherent in the law. It is not enough to put a good label on a bill and then to neglect meaningful standards and guidelines. The first thing that is wrong with this act is that it was not written by Congress but by the administration. As problems in the war on poverty have gained increased attention by the public, the administration, in its sensitivity, has refused to allow amendment to the act.

Last year when hearings on the amendment of the act were opened by the House Education and Labor Committee, Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL charged that the war on poverty was a "giant fiesta of political patronage—a political porkbarrel" and made assurances that needed directives would be written into the law.

It appeared that something substantial would be done, but as witnesses appeared, testifying to the slipshod manner in which the program was being implemented, pressures were applied and the hearings were stopped after only 5 days of testimony. A few meaningless amendments were forced through Congress speedily and then, with the poverty program doomed to another year of operation without direction, Chairman POWELL hastily called for a complete examination of the program. A large committee staff was assembled, hearings were promised in the field, but following 3 months of investigation, nothing substantial has resulted.

The major issue of the war on poverty, according to the attention it has received in recent months, has been the issue of the involvement of the poor. A truly effective war on poverty will not do things for the poor people—it will do things with the poor people. This is the difference between the welfare-dole approach of the past and the potential of the future.

Almost any social worker or person working with the poor can tell you what the poor's problems are—lack of education, lack of a job and lack of motivation, among others. One of the characteristics of poverty is that it is generally handed down from generation to generation. No wonder many of the poor have become cynical, bitter and without hope.

If we cannot involve the poor in the solution of their own problems, they will have no place to go but to the streets. No one knows their problems better than the poor themselves. They must be involved in policy decisions of the program where proposed solutions to the problems are being developed.

Make no mistake about it—all the public relations work on the war on poverty has raised great expectations among the poor. We had better make this program work or its failures will generate a new and more serious revolt among the poor.

There is another reason why the poor should be involved in policy roles. Many of their frustrations derive from their conflict with the big city governments and institutions. In some ways they have good reason for frustration. Certainly our big city governments leave a great deal to be desired. If the poor are not involved they are going to fight and circumvent the existing institutions. This means picket lines, riots and demonstrations that waste energy and talents that could be otherwise employed. Involvement can show the poor that they can work through existing agencies.

This does not mean that local government, social agencies, and the State should not have anything to say. I am an advocate of local control. With the right kind of representative community action boards, dictation from Washington should become virtually unnecessary. To date the States have been completely bypassed and so have the poor.

During the debate last year, the Republicans proposed an amendment that would insure balanced representation on community action boards. Belatedly, the Office of

Economic Opportunity has been applying our proposal, but it is not written into the law. Consequently, many communities have been torn asunder in the strife over the establishment of a program. Proper legislation could avoid this waste.

When the guidelines were first established for running the program, the administration showed little interest in the requirement that the poor participate in running their own programs. The first directives did not even mention representation of the poor, although the law requires "maximum feasible participation of the poor."

Mr. Shriver apparently now believes that the poor should not only help at the service level, but also at the highest policy level. The Bureau of the Budget and the administration apparently do not agree with Mr. Shriver.

Why is it important that the poor be involved? What will involvement mean? First, involvement will mean motivation. Being involved provides a glimmer of hope for people—that their opinions are heard and listened to. They see a channel of working out their frustrations and finding solutions to their own problems. Second, involvement means responsibility. In order for a person to act responsibly, he must be given responsibility. If he has no decision concerning the factors that affect his life, he will not feel that he is responsible to carry out the decisions made for him.

Why have the administration spokesmen suddenly become so cautious over this issue of involvement of the poor? The poor and their advocates have seen participation as an opportunity to change or overthrow existing institutions and government. The program, which the administration conceived as a political boon, or boondoggle, has suddenly boomeranged. The poor will simply not be pacified by another handout program when something new and better was promised and is available.

There is more to the poverty program than the question of involvement of the poor. There are other programs beside the community action program in which political motivation has compromised the effectiveness of the program. I am speaking particularly of the Neighborhood Youth Corps. This program, properly administered, could provide training for the great numbers of unemployed and unemployable youth. Instead, politicians have again stepped in to use this program for their own ends. Recent newspaper studies of Rhode Island Neighborhood Youth Corps programs are indicative of what is happening throughout the country. Rather than enrolling poor youths to whom this program would give needed income, training and motivation, enrollees are typically from families whose income is in excess of \$7,000 per annum. Although this income level is not high, it is far above the poverty standard. Some of the youths, I was appalled to learn, were college enrollees. People have been placed on the payrolls of the program as supervisors, when they were performing no functions for the corps, but holding other municipal jobs. The list of abuses goes on and on. The Boston program is the most recent example of corruption. There, enrollees collected paychecks long after their names were off the payroll, and some employees of the program collected several salaries through the use of forged identification cards provided to them by the program's employees.

The Project Headstart section is generally recognized as the best part of the poverty program. It is interesting to note this section was originally proposed 4 years ago by Republicans, but turned down by the Democratic majority. It was included in an education bill I coauthored, H.R. 6422.

The question is, Where do we go from here? The Republicans in Congress joined by a number of Democrats, the National

Chamber of Commerce and other organizations were opposed to the original legislation. The reason was not that we were against helping the poor; rather we were against the manner in which we felt this loosely drawn program would be administered. It is unfortunate that many of our objections have been borne out. Those include the lack of coordination, confusion, flaunting of established governmental structures and the cruel hoax of raising people's expectations far above the ability of this program to fulfill.

Despite objections, the war on poverty has become an economical, social, and political fact of life. We must deal with it as a reality. What are our alternatives? We can vigorously oppose the program, and by so doing, be charged with being against the poor. The second alternative is to ignore, or refuse to take part in, the war on poverty because this problem is not of our making. This approach would be to bury our heads in the sand, and, again, we would be charged with the responsibility for failure.

Our final alternative is to take an active part in the program. This is my recommendation. Our major targets should be the removal of politics and profit from poverty. The war on poverty is making many changes, some distasteful and some necessary, in most localities across the Nation. At this point, it may be to our best interests to take over and direct the poverty program with the dynamic and creative leadership that we know is available in the private sector. It is not only to our benefit, but it is our responsibility to take an active interest in these programs to insure that the decisions being made are carefully weighed and carried out in a proper manner. I am suggesting that the chamber members become, when possible, members of the community action boards. There may also be roles for you to fill in offering training experiences for program enrollees. This could be of benefit to the employer and the employee.

In this way, the poor can watch you in action. They will gain knowledge from your participation. You will gain more respect as a responsible community leader. As we all realize the war on poverty is far from the solution to the problem of economic deprivation in our country, we must seek other means of alleviating the problem. One of the primary problems of poverty is lack of employment by the poverty-stricken. Jobs must be developed for these people and more importantly, the people must be developed for the jobs. Those of us who have worked for a living or developed business enterprises know that the only real answer for reduction of poverty and unemployment is to create opportunities for the individual to become self-motivated, increase his productivity and add his effort to the acceleration of economic growth. Human energy is the mainspring to progress. Our continuing challenge is to develop programs that spark the enthusiasm of a young man or woman who is attempting to propel himself into orbit in the mainstream of American life.

With this thought in mind, a group of determined Republicans, myself included, have coauthored legislation that we think will truly provide this type of opportunity for working Americans. Rather than creating a new bureaucracy that might inhibit the management of the program, we have chosen to accentuate the positive aspects of existing institutions and enterprises. We have introduced the Human Investment Act package. The first of two bills in this package would encourage employers to increase their job training and retraining programs significantly by permitting them to deduct as a tax credit up to 7 percent of funds spent in such programs. When they provided the 7 percent tax credit for machinery investment incentives, I believe they left out the most

important ingredient—incentives for upgrading the qualifications of human resources. The purpose of this legislation is to correct this oversight.

The second bill would permit employers to hire persons over 45 without serious concern over the extra costs involved for health insurance and retirement plans. This, too, would be accomplished by allowing tax credits to balance, in part, any such added costs.

In case you haven't guessed it, I'm trying to use the tax structure to help create incentives for people to advance their way in life rather than destroy their initiative through excessive taxation. As we seek means of improving our education, employment, and other programs for social progress, we must seek positive means of making the tax structure a constructive tool in our way of life, not a destructive tool. Proper tax reform is the answer.

Rather than taking away initiative by way of free money and help, people should be encouraged to become motivated volunteers by permitting them to take measured tax deductions if they, in turn, accept certain social responsibilities.

This approach may not fit the Great White Father's protocol of paternalism, but it provides unlimited opportunities for a man to chart his course toward a life of dignity, self-respect, and the cherished independence that remains the dream of freemen everywhere.

Federal-Aid Secondary Roads—Our Stepchild Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, following my recent speech before the County Supervisors Association of California on the need for a more balanced highway system throughout the Nation, I have had numerous requests for the full context of my remarks.

Serving as a member of the Roads Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee, I believe the material contained therein would be of interest to other Members of the House. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I request unanimous consent to its inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN DON H. CLAUSEN
BEFORE THE COUNTY SUPERVISORS ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA, OCTOBER 22, 1965

It is an honor and a privilege to have this opportunity of speaking to my beloved alma mater, the County Supervisors Association of California. As a former member of this political fraternity, I can assure you that it gives me a great deal of pleasure to welcome your organization to my congressional district. The fact that you brought this convention to our beautiful north coast is, I am sure, appreciated by the people of Humboldt County. But, I am also certain that those of you who are visiting the redwood country for the first time are equally pleased with the hospitality and exposure to this land of the tall trees.

In selecting a topic for today's presentation, I decided to touch briefly on a subject that certainly must remain close to each and every member of the boards of supervisors throughout this great State of California. It has often been said that "a super-

visor who doesn't concern himself with the roads in his district can expect to be a one-term supervisor."

While we are interested in all types of roads—expressways, freeways, parkways, access and scenic roads, connecting roads, etc.—I believe the roads that require and attract the attention of county supervisors are the Federal-aid secondary roads.

During my service on the board of supervisors, it seems, we were always waiting for our allocation of funds so as to accelerate the construction of another section of roadway that was "crying" for improvement.

With this background, you can certainly understand why, when the opening occurred, I jumped at the chance to be appointed to the Road Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee. In the years to come, I hope my position and service on this important committee will prove beneficial to all concerned with highway matters.

In reviewing the progress of highway construction over the past decade, one must conclude that substantial headway has been made. Since 1947, nearly \$8 billion have been spent on Federal-aid secondary highways. That money has improved more than 252,000 miles of roadway. In 1948, there were 378,000 miles of secondary highways. Since then the mileage has nearly doubled to 620,000 miles with about 18,000 miles in urban areas. This money has built 32,000 bridges, it has eliminated 600 railroad crossings and has protected over 3,600 railroad crossings with warning devices or gates. By any standard—this is a good record—it is an impressive record—but it is still not enough.

The needs, the backlog for construction and the deficiency lists continue to mount.

In my judgment, the importance of our secondary roads has never been fully realized. The financial resources have not kept pace with the increasing demand for improvement.

Speaking quite candidly, it has never made much sense to me to build great expressways and freeways for the enjoyment or safety of our traveling public and then subject this same traveler to narrow roadways or "cow trails" when driving on county roads. Certainly there is room for a more balanced recognition of our overall highway transportation requirements.

It would seem quite obvious to anyone that as we step up our efforts to improve the interstate and primary highways, we should certainly do the same for our secondary road system.

As highways begin to receive more and more attention because of the increasing number of vehicles, the growing number of miles traveled each year and the resultant increase in gas tax revenue, it would seem only logical that secondary road improvement would keep pace. Regrettably, I do not see this to be the case.

Secondary roads comprise about 20 percent of the total road mileage in the country, but the money authorized for improving and maintaining them amounts to only about 2 percent of the total.

It seems to me that as we seek a balance in our entire system of highways in this country, a more realistic allocation of the tax revenues to Federal-aid secondary roads would go a long way toward providing the answer.

With the State and Federal Governments having preempted the gasoline tax source of revenue—it would seem reasonable that we have the continuing responsibility to reappraise our revenue allocations with adequate attention given to the changing needs of the cities and counties. Certainly, without the tax source directly available to them, the supervisors' hands are tied. If additional funds are needed to fund the programs, we at the State and Federal level must assume the leadership role and I can assure you, this is taking place. As you know the Ways

and Means Committee has jurisdiction over additional revenues and again, our Road Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee has forthrightly presented our case to the committee. The Transportation Committee of your State legislature have been equally aggressive at the State level.

At this point, however, I believe I should make known to you that your financial problems are not the only problems we must consider.

As you know, highway legislation before the House Committee on Public Works is generally handled in a bipartisan way. Shortly after the latest estimate of the cost of completing the Interstate Highway System was submitted to the Congress, the chairman and ranking member of our Road Subcommittee introduced bills which would have approved the cost estimate for the purpose of apportioning interstate funds, and would have authorized the appropriation of an additional \$5 billion to meet the increased costs of the Interstate System. The original authorization of \$37 billion now requires \$42 billion. Enactment of either of these bills would have provided for the completion of the Interstate System on schedule in 1972.

H.R. 6548, was overwhelmingly approved by our Committee on Public Works and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means to take appropriate action with regard to financing. However, it soon became obvious that the Committee on Ways and Means had no plans to act on the bill despite the fact that in many States the highway program was being delayed pending apportionment of additional Federal-aid highway funds.

As a result, it was necessary to act upon Senate Joint Resolution 81, which permitted apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds authorized for fiscal year 1967 only but did nothing to provide the additional funds necessary for completion of the Interstate Highway System on schedule by 1972. So, as you can see, we all have our work cut out for us. As you know, we in California want the completion on schedule so that Highways 101 and 50 can be added to the Interstate System.

The only alternative would be to extend the scheduled completion date. To me, this is totally unacceptable in view of the fact that completion of the Interstate Highway System will result in an annual saving of 8,000 lives and \$11 billion in transportation costs.

In order to emphasize my interest in the secondary road problem, I think it would be appropriate for me to read my comments made during the debate on Senate Joint Resolution 81:

"Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 81, a resolution to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to increase the amount authorized for the Interstate System for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, to authorize the apportionment of such amount, and for other purposes."

"I want to draw the particular attention of my colleagues to section 2 of the bill which authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive study of the needs of the Federal-aid highway system after 1972. The Secretary would be required to submit a report of his findings to Congress not later than January 1, 1967."

"This study will include, among other subjects, the extension or improvement of the present Interstate System, the possible development of freeways or express routes on a different basis, special urban highway problems, classification revision for Federal-aid primary and secondary systems, and their urban extension, and other matters. I am particularly anxious that the study include a comprehensive review of the Federal-aid secondary highway system, and officials of the Bureau of Public Roads have stated

that the study will do this. In a speech before the county engineers on February 21, 1965, Mr. Ralph P. Agnew, Chief of the Secondary Roads Division, Bureau of Public Roads said:

"Such examination (of the secondary system) on an intensive scale is scheduled in the study being planned by the Bureau of Public Roads in cooperation with State and local officials to provide a sound basis for such a highway program in the future."

"Mr. Rex Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator, has also indicated that the study of future highway needs will include review of the Federal-aid secondary system."

"While the dramatic interstate highway program attracts most of the public attention, the Federal-aid secondary highway program is also of critical importance to the Nation's welfare. It is in the development of the Federal-aid secondary system that the voices of the county and other local road officials will most effectively be heard. Under the law, programs for projects on the Federal-aid secondary system must be selected by the State highway department and the appropriate local officials in cooperation with each other. In addition to this, under the policies adopted by the Bureau of Public Roads, not less than 50 percent of the Federal-aid secondary funds apportioned to each State for any fiscal year after diversion of the highway planning survey funds shall first be made available to the appropriate road officials and shall remain so available until the end of such fiscal year for roads not on the State highway portion of the Federal-aid secondary system."

"The total mileage of routes designated on the Federal-aid secondary system, as of December 31, 1963, was 626,438 miles. The actual traveled ways of these routes totaled 618,041 miles. Of this mileage, nearly 180,000 miles do not have a paved surface."

"The highways on the Federal-aid secondary system are essential for the day-to-day activities of our citizens, particularly in view of our rapidly shifting population patterns. It is necessary that highways on the Federal-aid secondary system be improved to adequate standards in the interest of not only adequate transportation but also in the interest of reducing loss of life, injuries, and property damage which result from vehicle accidents on the secondary system."

"In light of these considerations, I was surprised and disturbed at the proposal of the President to divert one-third of all funds apportioned for the Federal-aid secondary highway system to the construction of scenic and recreational roads and landscaping and roadside development on roads, irrespective of whether they be on the Interstate primary or secondary system. I am certainly in favor of measures designed to protect and enhance the beauty of our highways, but I cannot believe that such should be done at the expense of needed highway construction. The diversion of needed highway funds from the Federal-aid secondary system, in my opinion, is deplorable. This is further emphasized by the fact that the proposal was not based upon any comprehensive study of actual needs of the Federal-aid secondary system and, in fact, was made in the face of the fact that, a study of all highway needs, including those of the secondary system is about to get underway, under the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 81."

"Mr. Speaker, I strongly support Senate Joint Resolution 81 and urge my colleagues to join me in its support. I am particularly interested in the highway needs study provision, and am looking forward to the report of the Secretary of Commerce and its findings and recommendations concerning the Federal-aid secondary system."

In conclusion, I want to extend my sincere thanks to the supervisor of my own district and your great organization for sending Bill MacDugall back to represent you during the

hearings on the previously mentioned move to divert funds from the FAS program.

I need not remind you of how magnificently Bill presents your case before legislative committees. Everyone on the committee was greatly impressed and the results speak for themselves. The pressures were so great the administration finally withdrew their request for fund diversion and asked that the beautification package be financed from the general fund. This was indeed a great victory.

Believe me, we have every reason to accelerate the construction programs now before us. We must meet whatever requirements are necessary to complete the system, but in the meantime, it behooves all of us to expand the cooperation and coordination of highway planning. We must restudy our highway needs with particular attention given to a functional reclassification of our highway systems.

During the past few years, we have concentrated on the critically needed Interstate and Defense Highway System. However, in my opinion, we should not concentrate solely on freeways and expressways—more attention must be given to the farm-to-market and secondary road systems. The Interstate System is a model achievement of what can be done with proper and coordinated planning. And yet, the Interstate System is only expected to carry 20 percent of the estimated 1 trillion miles that will be driven by 1976—10 short years from now. That other 80 percent—800 billion miles—will be driven on the primary and secondary highways.

It seems only logical to me—that our goal must be a balanced highway system. With transportation and highways recognized generally as the economic lifeline to a community, one can only conclude that a "balanced highway system" would mean a "balanced economic development" throughout our land.

With the acceleration of funds and a new emphasis on secondary roads, a comprehensive system could be developed that will speed motorists to their destinations in the safest possible manner.

And then one day, perhaps, we can minimize the slaughters on our highways that cost more American lives over one weekend than have been lost during our entire involvement in the war in Vietnam.

I thank you for the privilege of being with you.

United States-Canadian Relations— Address by Congressman Tupper, of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, our colleague the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER] is one of the most knowledgeable Americans in the field of United States-Canadian relations. As a member of the United States-Canadian Interparliamentary Group, Mr. TUPPER has had frequent and productive contacts with our Canadian neighbors.

Believing that too many Americans take Canada for granted, he led a group of his Republican colleagues, in which I was proud to be included, in the preparation of a white paper on United

States-Canadian Relations in which 26 recommendations for U.S. policy were discussed. The white paper has been enthusiastically received throughout Canada and the United States.

On the occasion of the Mapleleaf Dinner in New York City on December 8, Mr. TUPPER outlined the white paper and assessed its impact to that point.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. TUPPER's speech in the RECORD:

MAPLELEAF DINNER SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN TUPPER, OF MAINE, NEW YORK CITY, DECEMBER 8, 1965

The inimitable Art Buchwald, 6 weeks ago, suggested that, if Canadians seriously desired more attention from the United States, you would have to create such a serious problem for us that we could not afford to ignore you any longer. Buchwald suggested you might develop a serious internal Communist threat, or build your own atomic bomb, or demand that the United States give back the St. Lawrence Seaway, or build a Berlin-type wall along the boundary, or burn the American flag at Niagara Falls. But not even Mr. Buchwald's vivid imagination could anticipate the course you chose—to turn out our lights.

I suspect that throughout generations to come, a new cliché will be added to that long list of familiar phrases which are "trotted out" upon the occasion of every speech on United States-Canadian friendship. In the future, our two countries will not only share the world's longest unfortified border, a common language, a common culture, and a common heritage, but a common fuse as well.

On last September 27, nine of my Republican colleagues in the House of Representatives and I issued a detailed white paper on United States-Canadian relations. We listed 26 specific recommendations to the U.S. administration for U.S. policy, covering such areas as education and journalistic exchange programs, U.S. business practices in Canada, trade relations between the two countries, expansion of the United States-Canadian International Joint Commission, problems of water sharing, U.S. immigration policy, and the organization of the U.S. Government to deal with Canadian affairs.

It seems appropriate for me to review with you tonight the reception which this Republican effort has achieved over the past 10 weeks. Our efforts received broad editorial endorsement by nearly every major Canadian newspaper. My own office has been flooded with letters of congratulations and appreciation from Canadian citizens—both private and public. And, contrary to the expectations of some skeptics, we were able to achieve the not inconsiderable feat of producing a provocative document on United States-Canadian affairs in the middle of the Canadian election without, at the same time, providing either candidate with an election issue.

While we are, of course, gratified by the favorable reaction in Canada, the document was written primarily to influence Americans and the U.S. administration. While U.S. newspapers have also been generous in their comments, we have not perceptibly budged the administration in its lethargic approach toward United States-Canadian affairs.

The chairmanship of the American section of the International Joint Commission is still vacant, as it has been for the last 477 days.

Canadian relations in the Department of State are still anachronistically conducted under the Office of British Commonwealth and Northern European Affairs.

There are still no plans, of which I am aware, to expand the Fulbright student exchange program to include Canada.

The Merchant-Heeney report of 6 months ago is still merely a skeleton of guiding principles with no meat yet put upon the bones.

The more far-reaching of the Republican proposals of last September will take a long time to consider, to negotiate, and to implement. But the simple steps indicated above could be taken now, by simple direction of the President. And though they are small steps, they could do much to restore to Canadian-American relations a sound basis upon which more progressive measures can be built.

Permit me to pause for a moment to stress the need for a chairman of the U.S. section of the International Joint Commission. Throughout the 477-day American vacancy, the corresponding Canadian post has been filled by one of Canada's most outstanding public servants, the Honorable A. D. P. Henney, who on two occasions has been Canadian Ambassador to the United States. His appointment has been a great honor to the United States. By comparison, the long U.S. vacancy is insulting.

Through all the ups and downs of Canadian relations, the IJC has remained a steady bulwark of close international cooperation. Its technical studies prepared the way for international agreements on the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Columbia River Basin projects. Today it is charged with examining the important problems of water pollution and decline in the water level of the Great Lakes. In these and its more routine tasks, the IJC is severely hampered without an American chairman. Most immediately relevant of all, it is the IJC which has the technical capacity, if provided with the appropriate political leadership, to undertake an intensive international study to prevent a recurrence of the frightening power failure of November 9.

My Republican colleagues and I, in a statement on July 23, pleaded with the President to fill the vacancy. We urged him to do so in our September 27 white paper. In a personal letter to the President on October 19, I once more encouraged him to remove this increasingly serious irritant in United States-Canadian relations. Once more on November 9, the day after the Canadian elections and the day of the blackout, I again wrote to the President to urge his action. Perhaps a direct appeal from the officers and directors of the Canadian Society of New York would have a greater influence at the White House. In any event, I encourage you to send one.

One other subject requires special comment and immediate attention. On last September 30, the Congress passed new immigration legislation. I welcomed it and voted for it as a long-overdue change in U.S. immigration policy by removing the obnoxious and discriminatory system of national quotas. The bill, nonetheless, contains a serious flaw—an annual limit of 120,000 immigrants from the Western Hemisphere that might seriously hinder the flow of immigrants to this country from our contiguous neighbors—from Canada and Mexico. The State of Maine's culture has benefited greatly from immigrants from the Province of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces.

During the fiscal year 1964, 139,284 persons, including spouses and children, emigrated from the Western Hemisphere countries to the United States. Over one-half of these came from our immediate neighbors—38,074 from Canada and 32,967 from Mexico.

If the rate of Western Hemisphere emigration to the United States remains at this level or, as is more likely, increases, and if the bill is administered on a first-come, first-served basis, there is no assurance whatsoever that Canadian and Mexican emigration to the United States will not be affected.

I am sympathetic to the proposition that if regional immigration quotas are assigned

to the rest of the world, they should also be assigned to the Western Hemisphere, for there is no inherent difference between these nations and others. There is, however, one vital distinction between Canada and Mexico and all the other nations of the world. They are the only two countries which border directly on the United States—and in my opinion fully free and unlimited immigration between the United States and its immediate neighbors should be maintained.

The bill provides for a study commission to review its potential effects on Western Hemisphere immigration before it goes into effect in June 1968. I hope the study commission will carefully consider the desirability of amending this legislation before that date, to provide for a continuing free flow of immigrants across U.S. borders with Canada and Mexico.

As our September white paper warns, however, "If no limit is placed on immigration from Canada to the United States, the two Governments will nonetheless have to agree on a formula which will prevent citizens from third countries emigrating to Canada, meeting the requirements for Canadian citizenship and then emigrating again to the United States under the quota-free Canadian clause."

It is tempting to dwell here on some of the far-reaching, more provocative proposals of our Republican white paper, and I can assure you that our congressional group in the months to come will spell out in even greater detail the concepts which we have developed for a program of continued water sharing, for an expanded role for the IJC, for further study of how to expand United States-Canadian trade, for a systematic effort to increase student and journalistic exchange. But it may be more important here to stress a portion of that report which has, thus far, received only secondary attention.

We suggested that in addition to all the frequently cited and indisputably correct reasons for closer United States-Canadian ties, there is a new obligation that this highly complex and vulnerable world has imposed upon our two great nations. It is the obligation to set a standard in the conduct of international affairs, to provide a model for relations between independent states. If the United States and Canada cannot establish a model of peaceful and progressive relations, which nations can?

Throughout history, men have grouped together for their common security, for their common prosperity, and for both. The catalyst of unity for some was geography. For some it was religion. And for the last three centuries it has been the nation-state.

Nationalism as a unifying force has provided the impetus for progress. It has produced prosperity out of poverty and order out of chaos. Its virtues are evident.

But the vices of nationalism are no less evident. It has set people against people. It has allowed demagogues to lead by creating a mythical challenge from without. And in a world where man's capacity of destruction seems endless, national unity has become, in a real sense, a source of international disunity and intense peril.

It was misconducted nationalism which throughout the last three centuries fanned the latent embers of human emotion into the flames of war. It is a luxury the world can no longer afford. As the newly independent nations of Africa and Asia set out on the inevitable search for national power and national prestige, we must strive to provide for them a better example than the national history of their elders.

We said in September that the purpose of the efforts of the United States and Canada must be to seek to identify and reemphasize the constructive virtues of the nation-state system while minimizing its

destructive vices. In the transformation of men and nations, it is necessary to begin where the problems are small—and where the opportunity for progress is great. It is from this perspective that United States-Canadian relations takes on more significance and more promise than relations between any two other countries of the world. It is in this perspective that we share a greater obligation to set aside petty disagreements and differences in order to build on the North American Continent a model of cooperation between independent states which we would see repeated by nations everywhere.

That obligation extends far beyond the two Governments to the peoples of both countries. Its beginning must be found in education about each other. We said in September that there is an appalling ignorance about Canada in the United States, and we suggested that 1966 be designated as "The Year of a New Awareness of Canada." No matter how extensive its interest and dedication, the Government alone cannot create that new awareness, cannot itself forge the foundation of mutual understanding between peoples—an understanding which can allow our two countries to write the first chapter of a new and more noble history of relations between nations.

Therefore, I urge you and organized groups of Canadian citizens which exist in every major city in this country to declare 1966 as your own personal "Year of a New Awareness of Canada" in the United States. I urge the U.S. chambers of commerce, the Rotary, the Lions, the Kiwanis, our political parties, and trade unions, our church groups and educational foundations, the Leagues of Women Voters, and the World Affairs Councils to accept their share of responsibility for building a basis of understanding upon which our two Governments can build a model of international relations.

The challenge and the opportunity are there. The challenge and the opportunity are yours.

A Breakthrough in New Urban Transport Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, last session I introduced H.R. 9200, which would have amended the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide for an urban transport research and development program.

Twenty-one other Members of the House have introduced identical legislation. In the Senate, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] introduced an identical bill, S. 2599, which was cosponsored by 10 other Senators.

The sponsors of the legislation in the House, in addition to myself, include: the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY], H.R. 9201; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CABELL], H.R. 9202; the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBERSTEIN], H.R. 9763; the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER], H.R. 9995; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLIGAN], H.R. 9826; the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS], H.R. 9996; the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN], H.R. 9997; the gentleman from Connecticut

[Mr. IRWIN], H.R. 10857; the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON], H.R. 9998; the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG], H.R. 9999; the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCCARTHY], H.R. 10000; the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH], H.R. 10001; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD], H.R. 10002; the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], H.R. 9203; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RONAN], H.R. 10003; the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL], H.R. 9204; the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STALBAUM], H.R. 10279; the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], H.R. 9205; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK], H.R. 9206; the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER], H.R. 9207; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], H.R. 9208.

The sponsors of S. 2599, in addition to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], include: the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The January 1966 issue of *Traffic Quarterly* carries an article by me explaining the need for Federal research and development into the problems of urban transport, and outlining the provisions of H.R. 9200:

A BREAKTHROUGH IN NEW URBAN TRANSPORT SYSTEMS

(By Representative HENRY S. REUSS)

The most pressing transportation problem facing the country today is to devise systems of public transport capable of meeting the needs of large metropolitan areas.

As a cure for the intractable transportation problem, we are relying on the Mass Transportation Act of 1964. Unfortunately, the act can do little more than help cities purchase new buses or replace worn-out subway cars. While this program has been helpful, the Federal Government has not taken the additional step it should take. It has not sponsored substantial research in an effort to develop new, dynamic systems which will provide urban dwellers with good public transport.

Within the past year, the administration has committed \$90 million to a 3-year program to develop new modes of high-speed, intercity ground transportation. It has also given the go-ahead to a program to develop a supersonic air transport which could require as much as a \$1 billion investment of public funds.

We should be making a comparable effort to develop new systems of moving people about within our cities rapidly, safely, economically, and efficiently.

Today, nearly three-quarters of our population lives in urban areas. By 1980 the urban population will be 80 percent of the total, or over 200 million people—more than the present population of the entire country. All of these people will have to move about the cities in which they live. We cannot forever depend on existing transportation systems. The Federal Government must promote the development of systems which will supplement existing modes.

In view of this need, during the last session of Congress I introduced legislation,

H.R. 9200, to amend the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 setting up a research program aimed at achieving a technological breakthrough in the development of new modes of urban transportation. Twenty other Members of the House have introduced identical legislation.

The bill carries an authorization of \$10 million annually for the next 2 years—the remainder of the life of the mass transit program—and makes it mandatory that the research be undertaken. The research, the legislation specifies, must be designed to create completely new urban transit systems, rather than merely finding ways of improving existing ones.

SPACE AGE TECHNOLOGY IS NEEDED

Technological breakthrough is a space age phrase which has yet to be applied generally to earthly space age problems. Wonders have been accomplished in our efforts to send a man to the moon. There is no reason why this same genius cannot be put to use to send a man more speedily from his home to his place of work or other city destination.

A comparison of the Federal Government's expenditures for research and development illustrate dramatically how these efforts neglect common areas of human need. For fiscal 1966, the administration requested nearly \$15.5 billion for research and development. Most of the funds were earmarked for the Department of Defense, the space program and the Atomic Energy Commission—\$13 billion. Other agencies, including the Department of Agriculture, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, got lesser amounts totaling \$2.5 billion.

Some Federal research and development funds do go for improving transportation systems. But here again the effort is badly out of balance, with no funds earmarked specifically for intracity transit problems.

Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor, in testimony May 25, 1965, before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the administration's proposal, since enacted, to set up a Federal program to develop new modes of high-speed ground transportation for travel between cities, reported on Federal transportation research expenditures. He said that in fiscal 1963 the Federal Government spent \$275 million for aviation research, \$24 million for highway research, \$15 million for water transportation research, and \$7 million for research into intercity rail problems.

The funds invested in highway research, for example, were largely devoted to safety problems and ways to improve road design, construction, and maintenance.

Rail transportation research is being augmented during the current fiscal year by an additional \$10 million as a result of enactment of the high-speed ground transport program. The remaining \$10 million of the \$20 million authorized for this program, familiarly known as the northeast corridor project, is being used for gathering statistics on ground transportation needs and demands—\$2 million—and setting up a demonstration high-speed train to run along the corridor—\$8 million. The Congress authorized a total of \$90 million for the program over a 3-year period, with increasingly larger amounts going for research. Of the entire \$90 million, the Department of Commerce has earmarked \$8 million for the statistics program, \$18 million for demonstration, and \$64 million for research and development.

THE NEED IS FOR INTERCITY TRANSIT

It is well that the Federal Government intends to help achieve a technological breakthrough in rail transportation between cities, and in the supersonic air transport which will be able to fly at speeds up to 2,000 miles per hour. But we should recog-

nize the equal, if not greater, need for a technological breakthrough in intracity transportation.

Few statistics are available on the demand for intercity, as opposed to intracity, travel. However, one of the ways of measuring the need for service, as Secretary Connor demonstrated in his testimony, is in population density. The Secretary reported, as part of his justification for Federal assistance to the northeast corridor project, that the population density of the area which the proposed system would serve was 854 people per square mile.

The population tables for 1960 show that in the 120 largest cities in the country, those with populations over 100,000, the population density ranges from 6,000 to nearly 25,000 people per square mile. While these figures are admittedly at best a rough guide, they do give an indication of where the need lies.

In addition, the advantages which truly effective and efficient urban transportation systems would offer cities are numerous.

Air pollution, caused to a large extent by automotive exhaust which continues to aggravate the city dwellers and to injure their health, would be reduced. Prof. Morris Neiburger of the University of California at Los Angeles, an expert on air pollution problems, has predicted that polluted air may well kill off our civilization within the next century unless the automobile population explosion is checked. In order to prevent this he suggests we need to develop a vehicle which has the advantages of the automobile but is not powered by the internal combustion engine.

Accidents as a result of transportation would be reduced. Private motorcars are the most serious cause of vehicular accidents, and in 1964 automotive traffic caused 1.7 million injuries, of which 47,800 were deaths. In urban areas alone there were 980,000 injuries and 14,500 deaths. In addition, the costs resulting from accidents are considerable. In 1964 the damage bills for all urban accidents amounted to \$4.6 billion, with property damage accounting for over half, or \$2.6 billion.

Good urban transport systems would reduce commuter costs. Automobiles are expensive to operate. Including depreciation, maintenance and repairs, fuel, insurance and other related expenses, a car costs between 10 cents and 12 cents per mile to run.

Finally, strangulation of city areas by urban highways, excessive numbers of parking lots, and all the rest that goes with present commuter traffic results in making our cities uglier rather than more beautiful places to live and work. Establishment of effective urban transportation systems would help to reverse this trend.

ACT NEEDS RESEARCH MANDATE

The Mass Transportation Act of 1964 authorized a total grant appropriation of \$375 million over a 3-year period. The funds are given to communities to meet part of the cost of improving mass transportation facilities and equipment. The law also stipulates that of the \$375 million, up to \$10 million a year can be appropriated for a program of: "Research, development and demonstration projects in all phases of urban transportation (including the development, testing, and demonstration of new facilities, equipment, techniques, and methods) which he determines will assist in the reduction of urban transportation needs, the improvement of mass transportation service, or the contribution of such service toward meeting total urban transportation needs at minimum cost."

This is not a proper mandate for the type of research program that is needed, for under this provision all the funds for research, development, and demonstration have been devoted to demonstration projects.

The cost of equipping our cities properly with existing mass transportation facilities has been put as high as \$10 billion. Obviously, \$375 million will not move us very far toward this goal. Thus, the demands on the program are considerable, and the administrators apparently have felt it necessary to apply all the program's financial resources (including the \$10 million annually for "research, development, and demonstration") toward meeting the demand.

Writing in this journal for July 1964, John C. Kohl, Assistant Administrator (Transportation) of the old Housing and Home Finance Agency, the predecessor to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, described the Agency's policy toward the pilot mass transit demonstration project, which preceded the 1964 act:

"Further, the emphasis of the law upon 'carrying out urban transportation plans and research' has been interpreted to mean that demonstration projects should be oriented to operational problems and the practical evaluation of specific plans or the prosecution of basic transportation research."

The policy of the Department remains unchanged today.

While the demonstration grants no doubt lead to greater knowledge and understanding of urban transport problems, they do not begin to explore the possibilities that are on the horizon and where the real solution to our intracity transit problems lie.

Demonstration projects, as described by the Department, are categorized under three main types. The first type consists of testing the effect in changes in service and fare structure. The second tests new equipment and operating techniques (e.g., exclusive bus rights-of-way, new signaling devices, new fare collection equipment and new types of transportation systems), in order to evaluate their performance under actual service conditions. The third tests new techniques or methods for organizing, managing, promoting or coordinating transit operations.

An example of the type of new systems which the Department has assisted include Pittsburgh's skybus consisting of small lightweight vehicles capable of carrying approximately 30 people and operated along a separate right-of-way. Another example is Oakland's air cushion vehicle which is propelled by a turboshaft engine and capable of traveling over both land and water.

While steps in the right direction, these systems do not constitute a technological breakthrough. They are only a glimpse of what can be done as a result of extensive research.

INDIVIDUAL TRANSPORT DESIRED

The American people have an apparent desire for transportation systems stylized to their own individual needs. They want transportation which enables them to leave when they wish and go directly to their destination without transferring. Because existing urban transport systems do not satisfy this criterion, the city traveler today relies heavily on his automobile for getting about the city.

An October 1964 report by the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, Inc., of Buffalo, N.Y., for the Office of the Under Secretary for Transportation Policy in the Department of Commerce documented this point in reviewing new urban transportation systems still in the drawing board stage. The study on which the report was based was contracted as part of the Department's analysis of transportation needs in the Northeast Corridor running from Washington to Boston between now and 1980 and designed to forecast new highway technology which might be utilized in that area.

According to the Cornell report, an urban system which gives the city traveler "individual freedom, dispersal of origins, and feeder capability on the street networks, cou-

pled with a capability to reach the city center under automatic control on a high-density track system" is the mode of urban transport which should be developed because it would meet the desire of people for individual transport.

The report stated that a new urban transport system "must, to a high degree, be immediately compatible with people and their established way of life, else it will not even survive its childbirth and growing pains." Therefore, it suggests, the "direction for development in commuter transportation that appears to hold more promise is that of an automated system of small individual urban vehicles." The report concludes:

"The automated portion of the system could properly be routed and integrated with existing streets and urban expressways to best serve the origin-destination requirements of both the suburban and the urban population. This system would, at least in its initial applications, be designed to supplement the existing street system rather than replace it."

THE COMMUCAR—A GOOD EXAMPLE

A good example of the urbmobil and the type of new system which could be developed under an extensive Federal research program is the commucar which has been proposed by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The commucar was the result of a cooperative faculty-student effort in the spring of 1964 stimulated by the Institute's natural interest in transportation problems generally and by its work for the Department of Commerce on preliminary aspects of the northeast corridor project.

The commucar is envisioned as a small, lightweight vehicle which can carry up to four passengers. It could travel along guideways getting power from an electric trolley, or it could be driven independently under its own power. Besides safety and speed, the commucar, as conceived, would have the advantage of taking its passengers directly to their destination without the necessity of transfer. Because the vehicle as designed would be light and compact, it could be parked easily and in constricted quarters, even perhaps racked one upon the other.

Other systems include the starcar developed by the Alden Self Transit Systems Corp. of Westboro, Mass., and the teletrans devised by the Teletrans Corp. of Detroit, Mich. The starcar is quite similar in function to the commucar, while the teletrans system confines its vehicles to the guideways, keeping them under automatic control at all times.

While technologically feasible, more research is needed before model demonstration systems for the commucar for example, can

be constructed. Because of the scale of the project and the expense involved, this research is unlikely to be undertaken unless it is sponsored by the Federal Government. While conducting the research, the engineers could undoubtedly take advantage of advances made by the space industry, particularly in the area of propulsion and computer control. Perhaps some of the space advances could be adapted to urban transportation use.

The automotive industry, too, would be able to contribute its expertise in developing the vehicles to be used in new systems, and then in manufacturing them.

In fact, the research program could, and should, go beyond merely developing the technological features of a new system. It should seek to determine the impact it would have on the society in which it will operate. As John Kohl stated in his July 1964 article in this periodical with regard to the pilot mass transit demonstration program then in operation, "Overall, the problems of urban transportation are being considered as integral parts of the physical and social complex of urban growth and change; they are not treated as isolated technical problems, to be solved entirely by transportation considerations." This is entirely a proper undertaking for any federally sponsored research program.

FEDERAL INCENTIVE NEEDED

Private industry, as it is expected to do now, cannot carry the burden of this research. Mr. Kohl in a speech to the National Transportation Engineering Conference in Cincinnati, Ohio, on February 19, 1964, pointed out that the transportation industry is slow to undertake its own research and development programs because of the difficulty of getting that investment back through the sale of the new equipment and systems. Thus, only a federally financed program can get the job done. The histories of the Manhattan project which ultimately produced atomic energy for civilian use, and of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration which has contributed so much to our knowledge in the use of space vehicles demonstrate the value of a concerted Federal effort into a particular problem.

If the Federal Government had not taken the initiative in the development of atomic energy and space satellites, we would never have reaped the harvest we enjoy today. Without a considerable Federal effort to devise new urban transportation systems, it will be many years before we successfully cope with this problem. If we launch today a Federal research program for the development of new modes of urban transport, we can enjoy the fruits of the work in the 1970's.

The report of the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory concludes that the Federal Government should undertake a research program to develop new modes of urban transport. Among its major recommendations for improving transportation along the northeast corridor it says:

"Initiate a program to define, design, and develop an experimental prototype urban individual transportation system employing a specialized form of vehicle and guidance."

The report goes on to point out that many of the technical and system aspects of new urban transport systems still in the drawing board stage have not yet been solved. Consequently, it says:

"Technical study in greater depth, accompanied by experimental development, is necessary before the technical feasibility, economics, and public acceptance can be realistically evaluated."

Furthermore, John Kohl, in an April 16, 1964, speech before the Conference on Responsibilities for Urban Transportation Planning in Newark, N.J., predicted that a Federal stimulus would be necessary to foster the research necessary to develop new systems and that the stimulus would be forthcoming in the then pending Mass Transportation Act of 1964. He said:

"It is confidently believed that a very modest Federal effort coupled with the program to improve the financial climate of the transit industry can unlock the great research and development talents of American industries and universities so far as urban transportation is concerned. As a result, there can be available in the not-too-distant future, better and more appropriate transit systems to complement our unexcelled highway facilities and to round out an effectively balanced system of community transportation."

"If we recognize the true nature of the present crisis—that of avoiding the loss of public transportation—we can avert it before it assumes staggering proportions."

Unfortunately, the stimulus that Mr. Kohl suggested would be forthcoming from the 1964 act has not materialized. Thus if we are to recognize the true nature of the present crisis we need to establish soon a federally sponsored research program that will unlock the great research and development talents of American industries and universities.

We know the technological breakthrough is needed: to develop systems which can carry people quickly, safely, and economically from place to place within urban areas, without polluting the air, and in such a way as to meet the needs of the people for individual transport, and at the same time contribute to good city planning.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 13, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., quoted this verse of Scripture:

John 1: 17: *The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.*

Almighty God, teach us that no aspiration or hope or truth, vouchsafed to our souls, is too high or holy to be fulfilled by Thy love and power.

Grant that we may cultivate those truths which will make us wise and faithful toward Thee and give us a conception of life and duty which relates to the inheritance and destiny of humanity.

May the life of the Christ, which was full of Thy grace and truth, make us equal to all the issues, the problems, the difficulties, the tragedies of our troubled and tangled times.

Help us to realize that He is still the keeper of the kind of life which we must seek to know and be ready and eager to share with mankind.

May we feel that the need is urgent and the time is opportune that men everywhere must partake in His grace and truth.

In His name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

AFFIRMATION: VIETNAM—STUDENT BODY MOVEMENT AT EMORY UNIVERSITY

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, at Emory University in Atlanta, Ga., a large number of the student body at that great institution have organized and launched a movement to affirm the college students' support of this Nation's commitment in Vietnam. The operation is entitled "Affirmation: Vietnam." Under the leadership of young, intelligent,